DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD

Let virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy confidence wax strong in the presence of God; and the doctrine of the priesthood shall distil upon thy soul as the dews from heaven. (D & C 121:45)

April 1992 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH VOL. 9 NO. 4

THE CHURCH OF THE FIRSTBORN
AND ITS
FORMAL ORGANIZATION ON APRIL 3RD, 1992

TOGETHER WITH A BRIEF SUMMARY
OF ITS
PRINCIPLES AND DOCTRINAL TEACHINGS
AND A
SHORT HISTORY OF SUCCESSION IN THE PRIESTHOOD

Collier's Publishing Co.

Copyright © April 1992
by
Fred C. Collier
All Rights Reserved

Copies may be obtained
by writing:

Collier's Publishing Co.
HC 63 Box 1B
Hanna, Utah 84031
(505) 600-1842
ChurchOfTheFirstborn1842@gmail.com
http://Church-of-the-Firstborn.org

And *when ye shall receive these things,* I would exhort you that ye would ask God, the Eternal Father, in the name of Christ, ***if these things*** ARE NOT TRUE; and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, HE WILL MANIFEST THE TRUTH OF IT UNTO YOU, *by the power of the Holy Ghost.* And by the power of the Holy Ghost ye may know the truth of all things.

Moroni 10:4–5

That I amay *remember the* **Everlasting Covenant**, *which I made unto thy father* Enoch; *that*, *when men should keep all my commandments, Zion should again come on the earth . . .* And this is mine **Everlasting Covenant**, *that when thy posterity shall embrace the* Truth, *and look upward, then shall Zion look downward,* and all the heavens shall shake with gladness, and the earth shall tremble with joy; *And the general assembly of the* Church of the First-born ***shall come down out of heaven, and possess the earth***, and shall have place until the end come. And this is mine **Everlasting Covenant**, which I made with thy father Enoch.

***JST* Genesis 9:21–23**

The Church of the Firstborn
and its
Formal Organization on April 3rd, 1992

Together with a Brief Summary
of its
Principles and Doctrinal Teachings
and a
Short History of Succession in the Priesthood

by
Fred C. Collier

– 1 –

A speech given by Fred C. Collier on the evening of April 16th, 1992, in the home of Ursula Lemesany, at Manti, Utah.

Opening Song: "Israel, Israel God is calling"
Opening Prayer: By Robert Scharf
Fred Collier: Some of you people I've known for some while from phone conversations — Wayne and I have certainly had a lot of conversations — I'd hate to pay his phone bill.

I'm really pleased to be here with you this evening. I have thought we could talk some tonight about *Prophecy* — some about the *Church of the Firstborn* — and some about the *Priesthood*. There are many of you with whom I am not acquainted, and I am not informed regarding which of my writings you may have read or studied, so in our discussion, we will start out from the beginning. Hopefully you have got a good background in Church History.

With the restoration of all things, as affected through the Prophet Joseph Smith at the beginning of this dispensation, the Gospel was first given to the *Gentiles*. The prophecies speak of the restoration and clearly teach that our dispensation would be divided into *two basic eras of time*. These eras are described in the scriptures as the *"Times of the Gentiles"* and the *"Times of Israel"* (D&C 45:17–30; 3rd Nephi 16:10–15; Luke 21:24; Rom 11; 2 Nephi 28:20–32). These two basic eras divide this dispensation through a period of *apostasy*, wherein *the "believing Gentiles" turn away from the Fullness of the Gospel*. According to prophecy, it would not be until after the apostasy of the *believing Gentiles* that the *Fullness of the Gospel of the Father*, together with its *Priesthood* would be *taken from the Gentiles and given to Israel*.

When this dispensation began, the *Church of Christ* was organized and became the predominant light. It was a *Gentile Church*, established *for Gentiles* (D&C 109:60), and was to be in effect during "the *times of the Gentiles"* — it was not a *patriarchal order.* Later an *inner circle* or organization was established within the midst of this *Gentile Church*, and this organization was referred to by the Prophet Joseph Smith as the *Church of the Firstborn*. The Prophecies in the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants tell us that in the generation that the outward shell — which shell is the *Gentile Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* — when this Church turned into apostasy, the Fullness of the *Gospel of the Father* would be taken from them and *given to Israel*, and at that time the *Church of the Firstborn would become the predominant work of God on Earth*, just as the Church of Christ had been at the beginning of this dispensation. In the Joseph Smith translation of the Bible there is a passage that the Prophet added — I'd like to read it, as it has to do with our day and time. This comes from Genesis chapter 9, verses 15, 22 and 23. You won't find this in the King James version — you have to go to the Joseph Smith translation:

> And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying . . . behold, I will establish my covenant with you, which I made unto your father Enoch, concerning your seed after you. . . . . And this is mine everlast-

ing Covenant, that *when thy posterity shall embrace the truth, and look upward, then shall Zion look downward*, and all the heavens shall shake with gladness, and the earth shall tremble with joy; and *the general assembly of the* ***Church of the Firstborn*** *shall come down out of heaven,* ***and possess the earth*****,** and shall have place until the end come. And *this is mine everlasting covenant*, which I made with thy father Enoch

This prophecy tells of a time when the *Church of the Firstborn* would be established upon our Earth. As I have stated, the Church of the Firstborn existed on Earth during the Prophet Joseph Smith's day. Heber C. Kimball and numerous others including the Prophet have spoke about it (*JD* 5:129). The Church of the Firstborn, together with its ordinances, was established during the Nauvoo period, through the organization of the *Holy Order* and the *Council of Fifty* (*HC* 5:1–2; *JD* 8:154).

I'm sure most of you are all familiar with the Church of Jesus Christ — you understand the nature of its organization and what it is like. If someone were to ask you about it, you could tell them about its hierarchy of *Apostles* and the *First Presidency* — you could tell them about *Wards, Stakes, Bishops, Stake Presidents* — the basic doctrine and teachings, and its purpose. But the people are not familiar with the Church of the Firstborn in that same degree — they don't understand it. It is usually thought of like pie in the sky, which is something entirely out of reach. Many understand that it will be in the Celestial Kingdom, but they are not aware of its existence here on Earth. I know this was the common thinking when I first learned about it in 1970. Notwithstanding the Prophet established this Church as *a mortal organization* (and we know this through statements which he and others made) still the existence of the Church of the Firstborn here on this earth is not generally known.

The Church of the Firstborn *is not* organized with Apostles and Seventies — it is *a family order*. The purpose of it is to *exalt man* through the administration of its laws, doctrines and ordinances, that through the principles of *Eternal/Celestial/Marriage, Adoption* and the *Endowment Covenants*, men and women might be prepared to become *Gods* and *Goddesses*. The Temple Ordinances — those

having to do with the family, are, in fact, the ordinances of the Church of the Firstborn. President Young once stated that:

The ordinances of the House of God ARE EXPRESSLY FOR THE CHURCH OF THE FIRSTBORN (*JD* 8:154).

In our day and time, most of the members of the Church, are commonly in the habit of thinking that the ordinances of the Temple, including *Eternal Marriage, Adoption,* the *Endowment, Kings and Priests*, the *Fullness of the Priesthood,* and *Second Anointings* — that all these things pertain to the Church of Jesus Christ. These ordinances have certainly been attached to it in history and a distinction that these ordinances actually belong to another organization has not been generally understood. However, the TRUTH is that the Church of Jesus Christ was actually intended to be a kind of *framework or scaffolding,* established for the express purpose of creating this Celestial Family Order in a Gentile setting. It was especially organized for those who had been *born outside the covenant* — who had not been raised in the *lineage of the Priesthood* and who had not been prepared from birth and *by birthright* entered into the Family.

When people had lived in the Church of Christ and honored the basic principles that Church was to teach, they were supposed to be given a Temple Recommend, and through that recommend be admitted into the Temple, to receive and take upon themselves other covenants and other ordinances. Through this means they would enter into another organization. The way the Prophet taught it, and the way he originally intended it, *after a man received his endowments, Wards and Stakes would cease to be a part of his life*. You would no longer have a Bishop to whom you would go and ask for a Temple Recommend. You wouldn't be going to your Bishop to pay tithing. If you had anything to do with a Stake it would be because you were called to reach out to others, who had not themselves already received the gospel or been introduced into the Celestial Family.

The organization of the Celestial Family or Church of the Firstborn was established by the Prophet at Nauvoo and began to grow after his death. The Twelve did what they could to perpetuate "Joseph's measures", but one by one *"Joseph's measures" began to be dropped off*. It is interesting that even though Joseph Smith taught all these principles, including *the Principle* of *Total Commitment*, those around him didn't fully understand them. President Young himself did not come to a full understanding of the Principle of Total Commitment until 1847. This notwithstanding, there are many records which would show that Joseph Smith taught it, but it was not until 1847 that President Young became fully cognizant of its essence from within, and it was through the Power of the Spirit and the Vision of Eternity to himself personally that he obtained this knowledge. At the time he received this revelation President Young wanted to implement the principle of Total Commitment in the Church. He talked of this to his councilors and the Quorum of the Twelve, and at that time only two or three of them had any desire to receive the law.

Joseph Smith established the *Holy Order* on May 4th, 1842, and through the ordinances of the Holy Order, he began to organize the Church of the Firstborn. The final culmination came with the organization of the Council of Fifty. When the Holy Order was first established, there were no women in it — there were 10 men who attended the first meeting. They met a few times, and then because of John C. Bennett's immorality and the activities of Hyrum Smith, William Law and William Marks, who were members of the Holy Order, and who began to oppose the principle of Plural Marriage — because of this, Joseph stopped holding meetings and they did not meet again until nearly a year later, which was in the end of May 1843.

Question by Vickie Tate: I'm sorry Fred, I'm familiar with everything else, but I don't know about the Holy Order. Would you mind just briefing me on that, and also, are you going to talk about *the Doctrine of Total Commitment?*

Fred Collier: Total Commitment is a subject that would take a whole night in itself, and other than reference to it — we have publications — the Adoption paper, the pamphlet on Adam-God problems, and some of the speeches which I have given talk about it, and one of them has been published in the *". . .* Celestial Glory" pamphlet. It was not my intention to get into it in any big way here tonight, but true enough, *Total Commitment* is in fact *the* ***cardinal principle*** *of the Church of the Firstborn*, and it is through this concept and doctrine that the Church of the Firstborn is created on an eternal basis, and through which the individuals therein become **united as one**.

Total Commitment is a covenant wherein a person totally gives of himself to God, and there are **two different phases** of it. The *first phase* is rightly given when you receive the *"Endowment of the Third Token"*. This would be your first introduction to *"the Principle"*. In essence you would be taught to *consecrate* ***your whole being*** *— all that you have — all that you own — all that you are — your time, your talents, your life and your whole being — all of these are consecrated to God*. This means that there is no room in your life for anything else which does not fit into the covenant. In the first phase *you identify Christ's Church and the Priesthood thereof with God*, and you function in this consecration through the organization of the Church of Christ and its Priesthood.

After you have proven yourself faithful, by keeping the Commitment that you have made over a period of time, then you would be allowed to go into the Temple and receive *another endowment*, which would be the *"Endowment of the Fourth Token"*. Through this endowment you are introduced to another higher concept which relates to the same Principle. In essence, it would be the same Principle as that to which you were introduced in the Endowment of the Third Token, except that it would be *applied in a Family Capacity — between wives and husbands* and *between children and their parents* and this would be implemented through the Marriage and Adoption covenant, or for those who were born under the covenant, by receiving the Endowment of the Fourth Token. When you went

through the Endowment, you would be instructed in the Principle and what it meant, and then you would be placed in *a probationary state*, wherein you would be given time to learn how to live the Principle and the Covenants that you have made.

After you have fulfilled the obligations pertaining to your end of the covenant, you will be prepared to receive your *2nd Anointing*. The 2nd Anointing seals you, or gives you your *Calling and Election* for the next life — it seals your marriage by the *Holy Spirit of Promise*, so that you and your wife and your children will all be a family and *remain as a family in the next life*, with a promise that ultimately you will inherit *Celestial Glory*. These are the basic steps of progression, from the beginning of your introduction to the Principle of Total Commitment to the time when you receive your 2nd Anointing.

There are two other endowments that have to do with the Aaronic Priesthood, that should be given before this, and Total Commitment is not associated with these. Through the principle of Total Commitment as it is implemented in the Endowment of the 4th Token, you enter into *family relationships* and *create an eternal union*. This union is a lot deeper than what you have in a Stake with your Bishop or Stake President — through the covenant of the Endowment of the 4th Token, you begin to build an *eternal family relationship*.

In his last prayer, before being taken and crucified, Jesus prayed that his disciples would be *one with each other, just as he and his Father were one*. The union between Jesus and his Father is *a structured union*. Jesus said "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of my Father who sent me." In the Kingdom of God — how shall we say it: "Thus saith the Lord God, No man is fit to be a Father in my Kingdom until he has first learned to be a son". *So there is a growing*, and before a man is permitted to be a father, first he must prove himself as a son.

As it is in the LDS Church today, you go into the Temple — you take out your Endowments, and enter into the covenants and when you go home, *you don't know what you have done* or covenanted to

do — your head is in a spin — *you don't know what it all means*. Even the covenant of consecration that you enter into leaves you in a quandary, as there is no structured order in the Church whereby you can enter into the law and live it.

It is difficult to consecrate your whole life to God, when you have to leave home and spend 9 hours every day of your life working for some Gentile, just to make a dollar to feed your family. What that does is force the people to be part time Saints. They have a job which swallows the vast majority of their private life — their creative life — and then they come home and whatever is left of that, family and friends get, except for what the State takes etc., and once a week you go to Church. Before we can go to the Celestial Kingdom we must first learn to be Celestial people. But *we can't learn to be Celestial people if we can't devote our whole mind and heart and life, 24 hours every day for that objective*. So the law of Consecration, as it would have been implemented, would have made it so that in your daily effort to provide for your family, you would have been in service to your God and your fellow man. And rather than money being the medium of exchange, Love would have been the medium of exchange. And so *your personal self is lost in the service of others*, and *that's a beginning in the Principle of Total Commitment*. But when you enter into these Family Covenants, you develop a Total Commitment to your father and mother — and wives develop the same commitment for their husbands. There's no room or need for Bishops — there's no room or need for Stake Presidents — *your authority in the Priesthood comes through the family*. If you need ordinances done — if you need to have an Eternal Marriage done — if your children need to have a Marriage Sealing, they *go to their father or their mother for the ordinances* — that's where they go — that's where the ordinances are to be administered — the Priesthood and Ordinances are all tied to the Family.

Question: Who gives you the recommends to do this?

Answer: Your father — fathers are given the Patriarchal Priesthood. *Fathers and mothers administer the ordinances for their children and Fathers and Mothers teach their children the Gospel* — the whole Gospel program is tied directly to the family.

(Jim Harmston just came in through the back door)

Jim — Hello.

Comment from the audience to Ursula: Do you have a back door that we don't know about?

(Laughing from the audience)

Ursula: It is for all those who are hiding from the Bishop.

Comment from the audience: You see if you come in through the front door, you will get your picture taken.

(Laughing)

Comment: I understand.

(Laughing)

Question: Was this done at Kirtland — is that the Temple that they used?

Answer: The Kirtland Temple was a precursor and they never did do any Endowments of the 4th Token there — they didn't have any of the Signs and Tokens in the Kirtland Endowment, though they did do some of the preparatory ordinances. The most significant event to take place in the Kirtland Temple was the restoration of the *Higher Order and Fullness of the Patriarchal Priesthood*, which constitutes *the Keys that pertain to the Church of the Firstborn*.

We are all commonly familiar with the idea of what Temple Marriage is, and the difference between Temple Marriage or Celestial Marriage and Gentile marriage. Of course we all know that the big difference is that one lasts forever and the other one doesn't. One is Eternal — it is sealed for all Time and Eternity — it lasts forever.

Question: But not in the Temple?

Answer: Not in the Temple when you first get married. *You are sealed in the Temple when you receive your 2nd anointing* — that is, if things are the way they ought to be.

I'm not trying to relate things to the way the Church is today. I'm talking about the common understanding of Celestial Marriage in the minds of the people. Most generally, they understand that when they go to the Temple, they make a covenant to be married for Time and all Eternity — Gentiles don't do that. You know there

are a lot of good Gentiles who are moral and decent people, but they don't make their marriage vows for all Time and Eternity, and they don't have any Priesthood authority. So what I would like to ask is this: *What is the difference between a good Celestial Marriage and a good clean Gentile Marriage*? Is the only difference simply that one couple went to the Temple under the Authority of the Priesthood, in order to have their marriage Sealed for Time and Eternity — is that the only difference between Celestial Marriage and Gentile Marriage?

Vickie Tate: It sounds like it's that Commitment that you were talking about.

Fred Collier: There is more to Celestial Marriage than what Gentiles know about, and more than what the Saints understand as well. *Celestial Marriage involves more than a simple promise to be together forever*. There is a great deal more involved than just Promises and Authority for an Eternal Marriage.

Celestial people don't live like us — they don't think like us! The government they live in is not like the one we live in. Generally speaking, the marriages here in mortality are something like this: "It's a 50/50 deal — I will scratch your back if you will scratch mine". And this is thought of as a good marriage. But *in the Principle of Total Commitment it goes a lot farther*, and that's the difference between Celestial Marriage and a good Gentile Marriage — and the same can be said regarding the Church of the Firstborn.

There have been many patriarchal orders on this Earth. Any government with a Kingship has a form of a patriarchal order. There are a lot of primitive people that have patriarchal orders in their tribes, but they are not Celestial in nature, and the reason, for one, is that they know nothing of the Principle of Total Commitment as it is lived within the Celestial family.

Jesus says: "If ye are not ONE, ye are not mine", and it's through this Commitment that people become ONE. Not only did Jesus pray that we would be ONE with him and ONE with his Father, he also prayed *that we would be ONE with each other, as he and his Father*

were one — and Jesus was submissive to his Father — he gave of himself to his Father.

In the last 22 years there is one word which I have hardly used at all — it's almost like a four letter word. But notwithstanding my feelings about that — because of apostasy — the word is "Obedience" — it has a lot more than four letters in it, but because of the abuse of it, it's almost like a dirty word. "Obedience" is a principle, which when lived in context of the Celestial Law of Love and giving of self, is a basic principle of the Kingdom of God. It is cooperation. Without the law of obedience, Total Commitment does not exist.

A lot of people have a real shallow idea of how people are going to be ONE. The common understanding of it can be compared to a bunch of people who are living in a crowd, composed of thousands of people, and somebody asks the question: "What is your favorite color?" Suddenly everybody raises their right hand, and in unison, they all say, "Blue". Somebody else asks: "What is your favorite car?" and in unison, everyone answers: "It is a Ford." Somebody else asks: "What is your favorite fruit?", and in unison everyone answers: "Bananas".

This is not the idea which the Father had in mind when He commanded us all to be ONE.

The whole "Christian" world has been hearing about being ONE ever since the time of Jesus. But they don't have any concrete idea of how to bring that union about. *Elijah revealed the law, as well as the means* by which it can be brought about when he came to the Kirtland Temple — and after this the Prophet Joseph Smith began to institute that law, just as Jesus did when he was on Earth. Joseph said that if he were to institute and teach the doctrine that Jesus taught, that they would cry treason and put him to death. Joseph did in fact follow through — he instituted the Principle of Total Commitment, and just as he said, for that very reason, there were those who laid the foundation whereby he was put to death. It was enemies without that pulled the trigger and killed him, but the men who set him up were from within the Church, just as it was in Jesus' day with Judas. At the heart of the reason for the rebellion of these apostates, was the Principle of Total Commitment.

If you go back in Church history you will find out that Total Commitment on the lesser level, was taught before the Saints arrived at Nauvoo. When the Prophet began to institute this principle during the Kirtland and Missouri Period, Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, and most of the other witnesses of the Book of Mormon left the Church — the reason being that they were not willing to live under the government of Total Commitment. *The Principle of Total Commitment is a Theocracy*. As implemented in the family, it is a "Perfect Law of Theocracy" — it is *a Celestial Government*. You do not go down to the Federal or State courthouse to resolve your problems — if you have a problem you go to the Priesthood structure of the Family. This works because the Saints are all tied together in an extended family by the Law of Adoption.

Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer did not want to be governed by the Priesthood — they wanted a *Sunday-go-to-meet'n-religion*. They wanted to go to Church and talk religion, get all excited, get the Spirit, and enjoy the natural love of an association with the Saints. But aside from all this, they also wanted to live under the government of the United States. They didn't want to live under *the Government of the Priesthood*. Of course, the government of the United States does not require Total Commitment from its people. So a Theocracy (and by this I refer again to a Celestial Theocracy) requires a great deal more than the government of the United States does. And it was because of these additional requirements that Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer apostatized and left the Church. It is also the reason behind the apostasy of William Law and William Marks.

Every ordinance that we have, requires obedience to the Principle of Total Commitment — *it is at the heart of every covenant you make in the Temple*. It is the premise upon which all family relationships exist and continue to exist in the Celestial Kingdom. If you don't learn this principle — if you don't live it in your life, your family will not remain together after death. Joseph Smith said that there is a law upon which all blessings are predicated, and before we can obtain any blessing from God, we must first obey the law

upon which that blessing is predicated. *The law of all family related Temple Covenants is Total Commitment*. If you don't live the law, you can't have the blessing. In accordance with the Divine Plan, this Law was supposed to be taught in the Temple and that is where it was to be administered to the family. But the whole concept was lost. *The knowledge of the Endowment was lost*.

Total Commitment is kind of like food and nourishment to the Spirit — *the more you give of yourself, the more abundantly you bask in the Divine Light*. When the Church agreed to follow the government of man rather than the government of God, the need for great sacrifice and immense personal giving of self ceased to exist within the Church. When that happened, the Spirit began to die away. You can see the gradual demise or death of the Spirit by reading Church history. The early history is inspiring to read because it is full of the Spirit of God and Sacrifice, but the more comfortable and easy going the Saints became, the less of the spirit they enjoyed. *The immense sacrifice, suffering and giving that the Saints went through for the Gospel is incomprehensible. It's what makes our history wonderful and inspiring*. But once they signed the Manifesto and agreed to follow man rather than God, the great opposition ended and the sacrifice was over.

I realize that in the beginning *the Manifesto was given out as a lie to the government*. It was not meant to be what the Church makes of it today — but ultimately the lie became to the Saints what it was originally intended to be for the Government. This is because once written down, *lies have a way of out living those who tell them*. And so, true to the pattern of apostasy, after the death of President Joseph F. Smith, even though through his own personal experience, Heber J. Grant knew better, he began to take the Manifesto at face value and to force it upon the Saints with a vengeance — this is a clear manifestation of his own impatience to be rid of bad memories of hard times and sad experiences. But all these bad memories, hard times and sad experiences are the byproduct of being a peculiar people who are completely devoted to God in righteousness.

After the Manifesto things became convenient. It's kind of like birds that fly over the dead sea. For some strange reason, they can fly all the way across, and then when they get over to the other side on land they collapse. You can read about that in the book of Exodus, where they had quail to eat. Quail would fly over the sea — and by the time that they reached the other side, they would be totally exhausted and fall down to the ground, unable to fly another foot. Probably had the distance of the dead sea been a little farther, they could have flown farther, but once they quit, they could go no more. So it was with the Saints. The Saints gave their all in Total Commitment, but once they said "Uncle", they collapsed. After signing the Manifesto, it was just like falling dominos — one inconvenient principle after another was dispensed with.

In the Kingdom of God there is *a need for UNION. Without that UNION the Kingdom does not exist*. UNION as ONE among the children of God is the essence of the Celestial Kingdom. The ordinances of the Holy Order and the Council of Fifty were to create and govern the *Celestial Family UNION* — and not only them, but the gentile world as well. During the Millennium the world will be governed by the Priesthood.

Jesus says: "If ye are not ONE ye are not mine". In 1880, Wilford Woodruff wrote a letter to Lot Smith, wherein he stated that: *'We cannot yet decide whether or not to swap off the Kingdom of our God in exchange for a new State Government.'* When they were about to say "Uncle", which was in the last few months of John Taylor's life, President Taylor became too weak to run the Church, and so his first counselor, George Q. Cannon took the reigns of Church government. Most of the leaders in the Church wanted Utah to become a State, but they were told by Federal Officials that they would not be admitted into the Federation, until the Church dissolved the political union of the Saints. *But the political union of the Saints was a part of that being ONE* that Jesus spoke of. Nevertheless, in order to become a State (which status they desired in order that they might govern themselves, and then do what they pleased) they had to dissolve their union. So George Q. Cannon

walked into the meeting houses of the Church in 1887, shortly before John Taylor died, and he said: 'Everyone in the pews to the left, you are Democrats — everyone in the pews to the right, you are Republicans. Get together, form your committees, nominate your people to run for office, etc.' So literally, for the first time in the history of the Restoration, through a deliberate act of the Priesthood, political division was introduced among the Saints. As these political parties began to grow in power, they began to stir contention among the Saints. They were no longer ONE you see. So this was one giving up of principle. That was in 1887. In 1890 they signed the Manifesto.

In 1894, Wilford Woodruff had a revelation doing away with the Law of Adoption. You know it is really interesting — only a few years before, I believe it was in 1887, someone wrote Wilford Woodruff about the Law of Adoption and Woodruff wrote back and said in words to the effect that 'Adoption must be true — it surely is true or our Prophets have certainly been deceived.' So it would seem that Woodruff himself had difficulty in totally understanding the law. A few years later, I think about 1891, in a meeting with the Quorum of the Twelve, Joseph F. Smith, who at the time was Woodruff's counselor, made the statement that he thought the true order of Adoption ought to be that a man be sealed to his dead relatives, and seal up his dead just as they were born in accordance with genealogical records, and then take the very last man he could find, and seal that person to Joseph Smith. About three years later Wilford Woodruff got a revelation which in essence was verbatim with Joseph F. Smith's sentiments, and this revelation was established as the word and will of the Lord. In his talk, when President Woodruff began to tell the Saints about this revelation at the April conference in 1894, he associated the principle of Adoption with John D. Lee and the Mountain Meadow Massacre. In other words, he used John D. Lee's involvement in the Massacre as an argument against Adoption. The idea which he expressed was that you should never be adopted to a living man, because you never know what he will do, the evidence of this being manifest in the life of

John D. Lee, to whom several men were adopted. Thus Woodruff argued that men ought to be sealed to their dead ancestors. President Woodruff's logic is interesting, especially when you consider that we know a lot more about those with whom we have lived here on Earth, than we do of our dead, most of whom, we do not know at all. The fallacy of Woodruff's argument is manifest when it is realized that this same argument can be used against the practice of women being sealed to their husbands — after all, they are also alive, and until they are dead, you never know what they will do — so let us put off all Temple work until people are dead!

It is common doctrine that the dead have to accept the Gospel and ordinance work before it will be valid. The way Joseph taught it was this: First you do the work for your dead — then you have to teach them. You become their savior. You have to teach them and lead them along. But the work only begins on this side of the veil. When you get on the other side, then you must teach them and fully prepare them, that they might enter into the Law — either this, or the ordinance work is of no value. So you become a savior and father or mother — a Priest and King or Priestess and Queen to those who are redeemed through your own vicarious labors in the Temple. In other words, the dead become sealed as children to the living who redeem them. This was the original doctrine on Adoption. Hence the Prophet's teaching, that work for the dead is one of the most exalting labors upon which mortal man can embark.

Question: The dead are sealed as your posterity?

Answer: Yes, they are sealed to you as though they were your posterity.

The idea was that Joseph Smith was the Father of this dispensation. He was the father and God of this dispensation. Everyone that receives exaltation is to be sealed to him. He was the birthright heir of Ephraim, and Ephraim was what was gathering. Most all the Saints who accepted the Gospel were Ephraimites. So it was the tribe of Ephraim that was being created first. Once they had received the Gospel and Priesthood the other eleven tribes would come forth, and receive their blessings from under the hands of the servants of

Ephraim, just as it says in Section 133. Among these other eleven tribes will be the Indians or Lamanites, who are Manassahites.

I would like to talk a little about the Church of the Firstborn and explain how it is a family order. In 1847, when the pioneers came across the plains, they were organized as a family. For the most part, all the different companies were filled with men, who as sons, had made Adoption Covenants with one of the members of the Council of Fifty. Often times, the members of the Fifty were heads of their own companies, and consequently, in accordance with the Law of Adoption, were fathers to the men under them. When they came into the valley — they divided up Salt Lake City by blocks. One block was appointed for the Kimball family, and another block for the Young family — another for the Willard Richards family and another for the John Taylor family, etc. They all had their own block or property where their Adopted and blood families were expected to settle. They were going to establish the Church in a family capacity. In essence, *the Church of Christ was being transformed into the Celestial family of the Church of the Firstborn — the restored House of Israel*. It's kind of like the Church of Jesus Christ was all of a sudden being changed, like a caterpillar transforms itself into a beautiful butterfly. In the Church of Christ, members who had received their endowments and the family related ordinances were going to convert into this family order, and that's the way Salt Lake City was laid out when they first got here in July of 1847. Shortly after this Brigham Young went back to Winter Quarters, but the following year, when he finally returned to the Salt Lake Valley, he dissolved the family order, and *the Church digressed by reverting back to Ward and Stake organizations*.

I will tell you what that did to the family.

Question: Why did he do it?

Answer: President Young said they were too wicked — that they would not live the law — they were not worthy. When President Young received the revelation on the Law of Total Commitment, only two or three among the Twelve and his counselors in the

Presidency would receive it. Even among the Twelve, there were those who wanted to put it off. They would say, "Well, yah, some day we will do that, but not right now." But President Young said: "Why not right now?" The People didn't want it — *they did not want to live in the Celestial Law, because it required more commitment than they were prepared to give*.

It goes right back to the prophecies in the Book of Mormon. The down hill grade for the Church started in 1847. After the Prophet died they implemented the law of Adoption and Plural Marriage. They began to teach things like Adam-God and the whole structure of the Father's Church began to be revealed and established among the Saints. In 1847, President Young received the Law of Total Commitment by revelation — from then on, it went down hill. When the first companies came into the valley, the family order was established, but when Brigham Young came back the next year, for the most part the family order was dissolved and abandoned, and the organization of the Saints reverted back to Wards and Stakes. That was the first backwards step!

When you break a leg you need a cast and a crutch so you can continue to walk while your leg mends. But after the leg mends, if you continue to use a crutch, your leg will begin to waste away and atrophy sets in. The Church of Christ is supposed to be a help or assistant to the family. Its a crutch — something to help get people started on the road to their exaltation — its a place for Gentiles to learn to love one another. After they have mastered the basic social principles as taught in the Church of Christ, they are then in a position to go on and get together with their new found friends and loved ones and create a Celestial Family. When this takes place they have graduated from this other Gentile order, and after that the family has to stand on its own two legs. It has to assume the burden and responsibilities of those things that God intended to be placed upon it, including the education of their children.

Family industry should make it possible for sons to stay with their fathers — when they become of age, they should already have an occupation — they should not have to prostitute themselves, or

give themselves out to a gentile 9 hours a day for the rest of their lives. The family industry should relieve them of this paradox. When they are of age the family goes out and they have a house raising project, just like they used to build barns when somebody needed one. The whole family, brothers, cousins, etc. all get together and build a house. You don't spend the next thirty years paying for your house. This would have all come through the law of consecration and the united family order, if only they had followed through with the whole Gospel program. *The family would have been independent from the organization of the Church* — it would have been separate and strong. When the Saints went back to Wards and Stakes, it was like wearing that cast and crutch forever. You have seen what happens to a cripple when he gets paralyzed. At first his legs are just like ours, but he doesn't use them, and so it gets small and skinny and the muscle just melts away and both the muscle and the bone atrophies. That's what happened to the families in the Church when they went back to the Gentile order. That's what happened to the family, and the reason was due to the fact that the family was never given the burden and responsibility that God intended to be put upon it — I'm talking about the Celestial Family.

Children come into this world and they are like a white sheet of paper. They are totally dependent upon their parents. Everything they receive — the love and nurture and every blessing or fulfillment or need which comes to them is the direct result of the love and sacrifice of its parents — the parents become the source of all the child's nurture and needs. The mother and father give their whole being, their all, to raise their children and a natural bond of love is created through that service and sacrifice. This is the whole process of the Celestial Order. God created this patriarchal order through our bodies.

Before we were family, we were *self-existent, eternal beings* — as intelligences we always existed. When we entered the family union through receiving our bodies, we weren't just independent, self-existent entities anymore. All of a sudden everything we had and needed became dependent upon our parents. First they gave of

themselves, completely and through the years, the child grows up. The sibling has a natural love for its parents because of the sacrifice, service and love which it receives from its parents. The memory that it had of its previous life is wiped out, so the perception of the child is that everything in its existence began at birth. Through this means the patriarchal order is created, and this mortality is the means by which we are brought into the family of God. It is so in the physical creation as also in that of the Spiritual, for the Physical creation is in the likeness of the Spiritual creation.

In order to make the family strong the parents have to assume all their God given rights and responsibilities. John Taylor said, that parents who would turn their children over to be taught and educated by a Gentile would never see the Celestial Kingdom. Here you have little kids, and they totally love their parents and their brothers and sisters and all of a sudden their parents put them into this big crowd with a bunch of other kids, and teachers that don't love them and who don't understand or believe in the Gospel. You know it's kind of convenient for mom to get the kids out of the house — it's a rest for mom. But that rest is the beginning of the break down of the family in our life today. *Children are being* integrated into a gentile society and out of what ought to be a Celestial family — by the time they are in Junior High and High School the only reason they come home is to eat and sleep. They have a family, but their friends have ceased to be their brothers and sisters. Finally, because of loss of respect, it becomes difficult for children even to tolerate direction from their parents. The primary reason for this lack of respect is due to the fact that parents have shirked their responsibilities in order to conform to the popular demands of a perverted government and a decadent society. The whole, economic/social structure of our society today is deliberately aimed by the powers that be to break down and destroy the family unit and this is especially so where it concerns public schools.

When you receive the Temple Ordinances that are related to the family, you are supposed to assume the burden that goes with them. If you do, when your children become old enough to teach,

you are the one who will teach them. When it is time for them to learn employment, they will go to work with his father — if more education is needed when they are mature, they will be sent to college by the family. When they get married, dad does the marriage. When they need a house or home to live in, dad and all the brothers and sisters build it for them. This house is no free gift — remember, as of this time the son has already labored for years in the family industry. You don't pay the bank. You see your son will no longer be giving his devotion to some Gentile who doesn't care about him. The love and union that started with that child at the time of his birth continues to grow forever. There is nothing lost, and no backward step.

Total Commitment is a big thing — it is the essential ingredient of an eternal family — but it is important that we realize that it does not and cannot exist without love. Parents ought to love their kids — they ought to have the best interest of their children at heart. They must also love their adopted sons and daughters and have their best interest at heart — if they don't, it's impossible. There is, however a natural advantage in blood children — unlike those who are adopted, you have from the time of their birth to win their love and respect for you as a parent. When children are born to you, you have from the time of their birth here on earth to the end of your life, or the end of theirs, which ever comes first, to prove that you love and care about them. And how do you prove that you love them? You prove it by a selfless life of service and sacrifice as a parent on behalf of your children, and this too when they have nothing else to give in return. Originally all they do is cry and wet their diaper. Finally they learn to give love in return. See it's this Divine Family, and this family is the Celestial Kingdom.

Now we all talk about someday becoming Gods and Goddesses — and who are we going to be Gods and Goddesses too? Our kids! But what's the attitude of parents today. "I've raised my kids, and I'm not going to have anything more to do with them. You are married and you are on your own — your problems are your own — get out of my face and be gone." Parents figure that when

their kids grow up and get married, it's a graduation into another kind of life and in many respects this is as it should be. But what I'm trying to say is that even after the marriage of the children the family union should continue. As things presently exist in our society, the social/economic union of children and parents ends when children grow up and get married They go off and live and work somewhere else.

It's kind of like this — how would it be if you had a Celestial Marriage — you went into the Temple and married someone, and as soon as you walk out of the Temple doors, the husband and wife are talking to each other, and the husband says: "Well I'd like to live in New York." The wife says: "Well, I like living in California". The husband responds: "That's great, let's get together and have a family reunion in five years." What kind of a family would that be?

It's the same way with Adoption. If the man or son has to go out and give his life nine hours a day to somebody who is not in the family, or who is not his father — that makes it impossible for the relationship of Total Commitment to exist between father and son. And it is the same in matters that pertain to the Priesthood — if a man has to go to his Bishop for his Temple Recommend, or to his Stake President, he has to go to those sources outside the family for his Priesthood blessings. This cancels out the family — it weakens it — hence the family becomes something less than God intended it to be.

In the scriptures, the times of the Gentiles is prophesied about in our Dispensation, as well as the Times of Israel. *The Gentile period is predominated by a Gentile order — it is not a family*. But the Lord Prophesied that in the *generation* that the "believing Gentiles" turned against the Gospel, that their day would end and that the "Times of Israel" would come in — and Israel is a family. But heirship in the House of Israel requires more than a simple gathering together of a bunch of people who have the blood of Abraham in their veins — after all, even the believing Gentiles had that during the Times of the Gentiles — most of them had the blood of Ephraim in their veins, but they were not organized as a family. When Israel is restored they will be bound together through the

Temple Covenants in the Celestial Order as ONE . In other words, during the Times of Israel, it will be a Patriarchal/Celestial Family Order that will be established as the predominant work of God, to reach out to the world, and this Celestial Family Order will usher in the Millennial reign of Christ. That is what Section 77 verse 11 states where it tells us that there would be 144,000 — 12,000 out of each of the tribes, who would go out into every nation, kindred, tongue and people, and bring as many as would come to the Church of the Firstborn. The Church of the Firstborn will become a proselyting organization during the Times of Israel — the focus will be the family. And parents who won't assume the responsibilities of a family won't have one — at least if they do, it will not be Celestial. Husbands and Wives won't be allowed to receive the ordinances until they prove themselves worthy of them. After they receive the initiatory ordinances, they won't get any more until they live up to the covenants which they have already received.

Question: If I am understanding you correctly, in order for this thing to work, the parents have to give everything to the children, and thereby win their obedience and loyalty, rather than the way the natural man would tend to do it?

Answer: There is a covenant and promise on the part of each — Jesus showed the perfect example both as a father, and a son. As a son he knelt down in Gethsemane and he prayed to his father, and said: Father I don't want to do this — if it is possible, let this cup pass from me. Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine be done. He gave his life — not only in death, but also in living — he gave his all to his Father, because he loved Him. No son, and no one can give of themselves completely to another unless they love them. Outside the context of love, this whole doctrine about which we are talking does not exist. There is a Satanic version of it, but it is predicated upon hatred rather than love, and this is not what we are talking about.

In the case of Jesus, his relationship to his Father was that of a son — but his relationship to his disciples was that of a father. Jesus taught that he who is greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven is the servant of all. The father and mother have to give their all for

their children — Adopted or otherwise, and Jesus gave his all for us. At the same time, Jesus asked Peter — "lovest thou me" — and then he commanded him "feed my sheep".

Our Father in Heaven said: "This is My work and My glory to bring to pass the Immortality and Eternal Life of Man". If it was not for us, our Father in Heaven would be on the unemployment list — He wouldn't have anything to do. His knowledge is infinite, by all that we know. He is so far beyond us — He certainly doesn't need any servants to follow Him around to comb His hair or make His bed, or to cook His meals. He doesn't need that. But what do you do with your time when you have Almighty Power. The greatest challenge is to reach down to others and uplift them — to teach them — to make them better, and this is our Father's work, and it is the work of a parent — it is a complete giving of self for the betterment of your posterity. But all this does not deny the fact that the Parents will require Total Commitment from their Children — and that's the government.

I had a man tell me not so long ago that Our Father in Heaven has His own family Kingdom, and that it would be entirely out of order for His Father and God — for our Father in Heaven's God, to come down amongst us and have anything to do whatsoever with our Father and God's children — He would be unwanted. You see that's not the way it is. Our God has given His all to His God — forever! His children and Family Kingdom belong to His Father, just like ours will belong to our Father — forever!

Question: Joseph Smith [i.e. Brigham Young] said that our God Adam is the only God with whom we have to do.

Answer: That's right — and at the same time we have Jesus, and he is also a God and we have something to do with him — but you see, our Father in Heaven is ONE with His Father in Heaven, just like Jesus and his Father are ONE . There are not separate Kingdoms *— there is ONE Kingdom and ONE God. The Gods are ONE — they are ONE God!* Not ONE because they are like some kind of fluid floating around in space, but ONE because they are united as ONE , and structured as ONE, just as Jesus and his Father are ONE. That is

what President Young taught — that is what Joseph Smith taught. If you don't have that, then you have this ancient heathenistic concept of polytheism — you have a bunch of gods out warring with each other. They are not ONE. See Mormonism believes in many Gods, as also did the ancient polytheistic heathen religions. But the difference is that Mormonism, like ancient Christianity, believed that the Gods were ONE and that their UNION never ended. How could it be otherwise, since we believe family is forever. When you make it to be a God, you don't all of a sudden say: "Well, I don't have a dad anymore — I don't have any use for my father". *The UNION never ends!* The UNION is predicated on Eternal Commitments and Covenants of Total Commitment. *This is the Church of the Firstborn — sealed together through the ordinances of the Temple,* and this is the organization that is due to be established during the Times of Israel, which according to Prophecy is due to come in after the apostasy of the believing Gentiles.

We are told that with the restoration which was affected through the Prophet Joseph Smith, that *the Priesthood would never again be taken from the Earth. It was restored never again to be taken away. It didn't say that the Church wouldn't go into apostasy* — the scriptures are replete with references and prophecies that the LDS Church would in fact apostatize. But the Priesthood was here forever, *"hid up from the world with Christ in God"* to come forth, to be *"a light unto the Gentiles"*, and ultimately ***"a savior unto my people Israel"*** — Celestial Israel — the family we are talking about (D&C 86:7–11).

When the Church signed the Manifesto, all of the families went down with the Church. The reason for this is because they were all dependent upon the Church for their Priesthood blessings. They were all tied to the Church — to Stake Presidents and Bishops, instead of to their fathers and mothers. Therefore, when the Church went down, all of the families went down with it — that is, all but one — there was one family that did preserve the Fullness of the Priesthood.

Originally when the Prophet was establishing the Holy Order and the Council of Fifty at Nauvoo — I know we have one idea about succession being given to the Twelve — that's really kind of a white wash job on the Priesthood. Actually the "Keys of the Kingdom", together with the "Last Charge" were given to the "Council of the Fifty", which was Joseph Smith's Family Kingdom. The "Last Charge" was not given exclusively to the Twelve, but rather it was given to the Fifty Princes, and the Twelve were members of this body, just as were many others who had proven their faithfulness in the Priesthood. With the exception of two Gentiles, all those fifty men were Joseph Smith's adopted sons and they were given the Fullness of the Patriarchal Priesthood. The Prophet intended on sending them out all over North, Central and South America, to establish a family domain — a Family Kingdom, that ultimately would swallow up the whole of the Americas. That was what was expected when the Prophet decided to run in the election for the office of President of the United States, but he was murdered before the election. After his murder the Council of Fifty Princes of the Kingdom remained in tact and those who were members knew that Joseph intended for his birthright son to be his successor, but as of the time of the martyrdom, the Prophet's birthright son, whom he designated to be named David, was not yet even born.

In that regard, you might wonder about your own families. How would you set up a family that would last forever? You have twelve sons — you gather them together and you say: "Sons, when I die, I want you to go down to the local Bishop whenever you need anything, and he will take care of you — of course he is not in the family". That's not the way it is done. What you do is this — you get your sons together and you say, when I die this here birthright son of mine is going to stand in my place as though he were me to you, and he will be my representative to you. And in righteousness, anything that he says is just like I say it. That is what Adam did.

In the Scriptures, it says that Adam is the Firstborn — it says that in the Book of Abraham, Chapter 1 verses 2 through 4. Adam is the Firstborn, and the Church of the Firstborn is Adam's Church, and he

had a bunch of sons and grandsons and he got them all together in a council and he said, when I die, my son Seth will stand in my place, just as though he were me. And that son is going to hold my right — the right to stand in my place. Adam was the Firstborn — and after his death his birthright son held the "Right of the Firstborn", which means the right to stand as Adam, to the family of Adam, after Adam was gone from mortality. This "Right of the Firstborn" passed down through Adam's descendants — to Seth and on down to Abraham, and finally to Isaac and Jacob, to Joseph and Ephraim, and then it was lost. But with the restoration of our dispensation, together with the Priesthood and Gospel, and through the revelations we have received, we know that Joseph Smith was birthright heir over all Ephraim — he held "The Right of the Firstborn". So he stood as Adam to the human family. And who was Adam? He was God! Hence Joseph stood as God to the people.

Some people didn't like that. William Law didn't like it. You know Joseph Smith was teaching the Plurality of Gods for years before he ever got killed by William Law and the others who betrayed him to his enemies. He was preaching the Plurality of Gods, and all of that didn't bother William Law. What finally bothered William Law was when Joseph Smith began to point out to him that if there are many Gods in Heaven, some of them might live down here on Earth, and that he, Joseph, was one of them. And not only was he one of them, but he stood as God to the people of Earth, who were the descendants of Adam. So William Law came under the jurisdiction of the Prophet's theocratic dominion. William Law didn't want that you see, and to resolve his dilemma he went back to the very source of the problem. He didn't say, I don't want you to be my God, and notwithstanding, there are many Gods, Joseph ain't my God — he just said, I don't believe in the plurality of Gods — quite to the contrary, I only believe in one God, and He is so far removed from me that I can't see Him or feel Him, so I don't have to worry about what He says or thinks. I only believe in one God and He is not near me, therefore you can't be God.

But then again, lets all go back to this idea — we as Latter-day Saints all believe that someday we are going to be Gods and Goddesses to our kids. Where are we going to prove this? Where are we going to establish the relationship — remember that revelation the Prophet received: "There is a Law upon which all blessings are predicated, and if we receive any blessing, it can only be on the condition of obedience to the Law upon which it is predicated." Well if you can't live with your kids in this world, and they learn to relate to you in this "Perfect Law of Celestial Theocracy" as it is lived in the Celestial Kingdom, and thereby learn to honor you as their God and Goddess when they live here in their mortal probation, do you think that they are going to do any different in the next life? This is the place where we are supposed to prepare our families and create a Celestial Family — this is the time of test — the time of trial — this is where we have to make it. If we don't make it here, it will be necessary for us to come back — that is if we don't commit the unpardonable sin. We can waste forever, but we are not going to get the blessing until we live the law. We are coming right into the Millennium. We are going to have a thousand years of peace, and then there is going to be a short period of evil, and then finally the world is going to be made into a Celestial abode, and all of those who haven't learned to live a Celestial Law by then are going to have to find a new home.

We have to learn to live in the Law of Total Commitment with our families and children here in this life. Your children have to learn to respect you as their God and Goddess in this Perfect Law of Celestial Theocracy — and how can they do it, or how can they live in the Law of Total Commitment if you yourself won't live it! It is not right. What is required of a man in the Kingdom of God? As Jesus said, he who is the greatest is the servant of all. How can a parent require from their children that which they themselves will not live? How can a man require of his wife that which he won't do? If he can't live in Total Commitment with his father and mother, how can he expect his wife to live it with him. It is immoral! It is contrary to the law of God. God's house is a house of order, not a

house of confusion. There is a way that it works, and there are a lot of ways that it doesn't — but only one way that it does — and that's the Gospel of the Father and the Gospel of Jesus Christ — it's all in the foundation. So this is the real thing that we all have to consider upon, if we expect to have our families with us in the next life — it's a lot more than simply paying a visit to the Temple, and it's a lot more than Gentile marriage!

Question: I can really tell — I can feel the spirit here tonight. I also believe in what you are saying, but my problem is, how can we do it?

Answer: Joseph Smith "advised all the Saints to search deeper and deeper into the mysteries of Godliness". In continuing in the same statement, he said: "A man can do nothing of himself *unless he is lead in the right way and the Priesthood is for this purpose"*.

We have a prophecy that the Priesthood would never again be taken from the Earth, but this is not to say that the Church would never go from the Priesthood or turn into apostasy.

If we go back and look at the beginnings, and understand what happened in history — we have two things — we have to have the Spirit of God to guide us, and we have to know what we are looking for — we need Knowledge! Joseph said "we must have knowledge or we are likely to be deceived", and that "no man can be saved in ignorance".

You know if we all went to the zoo and we were looking for a Hippo, but none of us had ever seen one before, and we didn't know what a Hippo looked like, and we went to the zoo and saw all the cages and every one of them said Hippo on it — and as you went by the cages they all said Hippo, Hippo, Hippo, Hippo — there would be a Snake in one cage, but it had a label on it that said Hippo and another cage had a Squirrel in it — and another had a Gorilla — and yet they were all labeled Hippo — if you didn't have the necessary knowledge to know how to identify a Hippo, you wouldn't know what you were looking at, and even if you were looking for a Hippo, you wouldn't know you had found one and wouldn't be able to identify one, even if you were staring one in the face. So if

you want to find the Kingdom of God, you have got to learn what you are looking for, and you have got to learn how to identify it. There are a lot of Hippos out there that ain't Hippos! There are a lot of people claiming Priesthood that don't know what it is and who don't have it. There are a lot of people claiming all kinds of things, that have no idea of what we are talking about here tonight.

Joseph Smith said that *'the Priesthood was the channel through which all knowledge, doctrine, the plan of salvation and every important matter is revealed from Heaven.'* In continuing he also said that even from before the foundations of the earth were laid, the Priesthood was the source and channel of all Heavenly Knowledge, and that it would continue to be that way until the end of time. The light and knowledge of the Kingdom of God, and the Revelation pertaining thereto will always come through the fountainhead of the Priesthood — to the individual who holds the Keys of the Priesthood.

This is a direct affirmation from the Prophet that where the fountainhead of knowledge and revelation is, there will also be the fountainhead of the Priesthood. And this being so, we may set it down that those who claim to possess and control the Keys of the Priesthood, and the Power to Dictate in Celestial things, but who at the same time are basically ignorant and uninspired — you may set it down that such individuals are false Prophets. A Prophet ought to know something about God and Heavenly things — he ought to understand the Kingdom of God and the Heavenly Law — he ought to know the Celestial Order of things. If he does not, and he comes forth claiming great Power and Authority, you may set it down that he is a liar and a fraud — or at best that he has certainly deceived himself. And this will include all the false Prophets who are presently popping up, as well as the President of an Apostate Church and especially and more particularly his *so called* counselors.

Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh — you may know them by their fruits. If a man has seen into Heaven he ought to be able to tell about it — and he ought to do more than

parrot dead Prophets — he ought to speak as one having authority and not just as one of the Scribes or Pharisees — and he ought to know more too than simply to point the finger at the Church and say apostasy.

How do we know that Joseph Smith was a Prophet of God? Do we know this simply because he stood up one day, years after the fact and said that he saw the Father and the Son in a Vision?

Answer from the audience: No.

Fred Collier: It's the beauty that he gave us. He taught us who we are! He taught us where we came from! He taught us how to better ourselves in order that we might fulfill the measure of our creation here on Earth. If you take away these things, the restoration is nothing but an empty sack — nothing but a bunch of stories.

If you have knowledge and can understand, then you know what the Kingdom is and you know about the Priesthood and what it is. If you understand these things, then you can look at the history of the Church and comprehend it.

A lot of people have been studying prophecy — the Jews were real big with the study of Prophecy. They knew there was a Messiah due any day, and there were a whole bunch of them popping up all over the place, and when Jesus came along, a lot of the people were hopeful that he would be the Messiah. The Prophecies that they were reading about told of how the Messiah would come down and redeem Israel and destroy their enemies, and free them from bondage. But when Jesus came into town, he came riding on a donkey and that just wasn't good enough. So in the end they crucified him. They were looking for their Savior, and they murdered him.

In our day, Alexander Campbell and other people like him became inspired with the idea that the Church had gone into apostasy and that there had to be a new restoration of the ancient principles of the Gospel. Sydney Rigdon was one of the ministers in Campbell's Church. Along comes Mormonism and the restoration, just like Alexander Campbell said it would happen. But guess what? Alexander Campbell was too proud to submit to an unread, ignorant farm boy.

Consequently, when the very thing that he believed in and hoped for, came staring him in the face, he rejected it. Instead of becoming its friend, he became its enemy. And he was sincere. Sidney Rigdon, on the other hand, took his whole Church, and said: "I am joining — I am going to get baptized, and anybody that wants to come with me, lets go down and do it right now. This is what we have been looking for."

The people here tonight are all in the same situation. You are looking for something — you are looking for something to come. However, first of all you must learn what you are looking for and how to identify it. But in the end, how are you really going to know when you have found the Kingdom? Remember the parable of the ten virgins — *"they that are wise,* ***who have taken the Holy Spirit for their guide,*** *who have not been deceived"*, they are the ones who will recognize the Kingdom when it comes.

Heber C. Kimball and others prophesied that out of the hearts core of this people (i.e. the Latter-day Saints) will come a people, upon whom the Lord will bestow His choicest blessings. How are those choice people going to recognize the Kingdom when it comes? I'll tell you how to know. It's going to be so easy, you won't need the Spirit of God at all! Joseph Smith is going to come back as a glorified, resurrected being, and everybody is going to see him shining brilliantly with banners like the Sun, and everyone will say with one unanimous voice: "There is our leader, let us follow him!"

(Laughing from the audience)

It never happened that way with Jesus Christ — it didn't happen that way with Joseph Smith and it won't happen today. He is going to come riding into town on a donkey. He is going to teach the truth — he is going to have revelation from Heaven — he will be the Channel through which that revelation comes. Through that means, people will know. By the Spirit they will open their eyes — they will be touched in their hearts and this is what we all have to go by today — the Spirit of God.

I think most of you people believe in the possibility of living in mortality more than once. So do I. So lets talk a little about what

the Scriptures say about that. There are three kinds of worlds, right. There are the Celestial, Terrestrial and Telestial Kingdoms, and there are also three kinds of resurrections and hence, three kinds of resurrected bodies. The Celestial resurrection — that's like the Sun — that's the kind Jesus got. Then there is another kind of world — a Terrestrial world and a Terrestrial resurrection — but this is not the same as a Celestial resurrection at all. Finally, there is a Telestial Resurrection — and what have we got here? What kind of world are we living on?

According to Section 88, those who receive a Telestial resurrection don't get the same kind of body as those who receive a Celestial resurrection. A Telestial resurrection is mortal birth. That's what we have here. We are living in a Telestial world — go to the Temple — it says it right out. And what do the scriptures say that we have for our guide in this Telestial world. Section 76 tells us that those in the Celestial Kingdom have the right to the presence of the Father in their lives. In the Terrestrial Kingdom they have the right to the presence of Jesus. But us folks down here in the Telestial world, what we get for our guide is the Holy Ghost or the Spirit of God. If that isn't good enough, then we don't have to have anything — and nothing is what we get! This is what the scriptures refer to when they speak of having *oil in our lamps*.

Joseph Smith gave the "Last Charge" to the "Council of Fifty". The Keys of the Kingdom were not committed to the Twelve exclusively — quite to the contrary, they were given to the Council of Fifty, which is as it should be, as the Council of Fifty was the Kingdom of God, and for this reason it was the organization to which the "Keys of the Kingdom" naturally belonged. That this is so is clearly stated in the revelation which the Prophet received when the Kingdom was given its name:

> Verily thus saith the Lord: This is the name by which you shall be called — "The Kingdom of God and His Laws, ***with the Keys and Power thereof***, *and judgment in the hands of his servants*, Ahman Christ." (*Unpublished Revelations*, Part 57a)

Even President Young acknowledged that the Keys of the Kingdom were rightly vested in the Council of Fifty. On May 3rd, 1846, he made the following statement in a meeting with the Saints:

> Before the death of Joseph, he said that: 'Where the Keys of the Kingdom were, there would be the place to gather.' Now *where ever the 12 & Council [of Fifty] are, there will the Keys be also,* & there will be the place of gathering. (Diary of John D. Lee, entry for May 3rd, 1846, Church Archives, SLC)

Bishop George Miller, Alexander Badlam and Apostle Lyman Wight were three other members of the Council who believed that the Fifty had the right to control the Keys of the Priesthood. In the following statement, Wight tells of his and Bishop George Miller's induction into the Council, and of its right to the Priesthood:

> [In about the middle of April 1844] we were kindly received by the Prophet, and introduced into what was then called ***the Grand Council of the church***, or in other words, the perfect organization of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints on earth [i.e. the perfect organization of the Celestial Church of the Firstborn]. This Council consisted of fifty members, *with* ***full authority*** *to build up the Kingdom of God on earth*, that His will might be done on earth as in heaven. (*An Address by way of an Abridged Account and Journal of My Life . . . by Lyman Wight, to be published in forthcoming issue of Doctrine of the Priesthood)*

Benjmain F. Johnson, who at the time of its organization, was one of the youngest members of the Council, has left many accounts of the "Last Charge" as it was given to the Fifty. He did not always tell the whole story, and what he did say depended largely upon who he was talking to and the circumstances of the occasion. Without a doubt, Johnson wrote the most direct account in his own personal record, which was never published until several decades after his death. Unfortunately, even when it was published, it was edited and all reference to the Fifty was removed, consequently it was made to read as though the Last Charge was given exclusively to the Twelve rather than the Fifty. The following is the unedited account:

At one of the last meetings of the Council of Fifty after all had been completed and the Keys of Power committed [to the Fifty], and in the presence of the Quorum of the Twelve and others who were encircled around him, he arose, gave a review of his life and sufferings, and of the testimonies he had borne, and said that the Lord had now accepted his labors and sacrifices, and did not require him longer to carry the responsibilities and burden and bearing off this kingdom, *and turning to those around him, i**ncluding the twelve,*** he said, "And in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ I now place it ***upon you my brethren of this Council*** [i.e. the Council of Fifty].

The Prophet's revelation declares that the Kingdom of God or Council of Fifty would possess "the Keys and power thereof". But the big question is: What do the "Keys and Power" of the Kingdom consist of. From the time of its organization in 1844, this was kept as a well guarded secret. Some time after 1885, Johnson began to write his autobiography, and among other things he stated the following:

About this time [the spring of 1844 on March 10th and 11th] was organized his private Council of 50, the embryo Kingdom of God upon the Earth — an organization distinct from the Church. . . . . a Government of God for the people and by the people, in which man will be taught to know *his origin* and to govern himself . . .

By the Prophet, Br. Babbitt and I were called to Nauvoo, and made members of this Council at its organization; but of its full *object, keys and by-laws* **I am not fully at liberty now to write**, *but the future will write up the past*, **when all will be made plain**. (A Life Review, Mss, pp. 94, 96, Church Archives, SLC; note: the above material was edited out of the published account)

Johnson here states that he could not then write about the "full object, Keys and by-laws" of the Kingdom, but affirms that *"the future will write up the past when all will be made plain"*. Years later, in 1903, in a letter which he wrote to the First Presidency of the Church, Johnson again affirmed that there were things about the Kingdom which he could not write down, nevertheless, he did write out and explain in explicit terms just exactly what authority

was circumscribed and given to the Fifty. In this letter he stated that "the *Keys of the Endowments* ***to the last Anointing and Sealing*** *together with the Keys of Salvation for the dead, with the eternity of the Marriage Covenant and* ***Power of Endless Lives***" constituted the Keys and power that were committed to the Council of Fifty. (*UPR* 61:33)

The members of the Council of Fifty knew that Joseph was going to appoint his son to be his heir. President Young went so far as to say that in a meeting with the Fifty, he heard the Prophet say that he would yet have a son named David, and that this son would be the Prophet's successor and Birthright Heir. But Emma screwed things up. The Prophet died young, before his son David was even born, and at the time of the Prophet's death, Joseph III was only twelve. You don't put a boy on the Throne. In ancient governments, when the King died before his children were of age, someone else would sit on the Throne, or at least govern the Kingdom until the Heir became of age. At the time of Joseph's death his children weren't old enough, this doesn't mean that the Fifty were looking for somebody else to be the Prophet's successor.

Joseph said: If I die, I want my brother Hyrum to stand in my place until my children become of age. He never intended for Hyrum to be his successor as a birthright heir, but only to take over until his children became of age. Hyrum was stubborn and said: No, I got you into this, I talked you into going back — I am going with you — if you die, we die together. Hyrum wouldn't part with Joseph. Consequently, Joseph said: If Hyrum and I both die, I want my brother, Samuel Smith to be my successor, until my children become of age. It will be noticed that in all of this there was no mention of the Twelve. But Samuel died about three weeks after the Prophet was murdered, and it may very well have been murder that caused his death. Either it was murder, or it was divine intervention from Heaven — it was quite a coincidence.

All the methods and mediums through which the Prophet had intended for succession to follow had failed. The Twelve came back into town and Samuel was already dead. When the Prophet died, the

Twelve were back east in New York etc., preaching for the Prophet's candidacy as President of the United States. By the time they came back to Nauvoo, Sidney Rigdon was trying to take over the Church. Samuel Smith was dead, and Brigham Young stood up to speak, and low and behold, all of a sudden he started looking and talking just like Joseph Smith. And all those who had *oil in their lamps* could see it just as plain as the nose on your face. They thought it was Joseph — they knew it was Joseph and they knew that for the time being, Brigham was to be the man to stand in Joseph's shoes. Before they left Nauvoo, the Council of Fifty tried to work with Emma, but Emma was real vehement about plural marriage and all the secrets of the Kingdom being made public, and she was rebellious.

Question: Did she get along with Brigham very well?

Answer: No, Brigham and Emma were two different kinds of people — they were just different types of folks. Brigham didn't have a whole lot of patience for Emma, but he did try with her, and just before the exodus from Nauvoo, the Council of Fifty got together and they appointed Benjamin F. Johnson and Newell K. Whitney to go see Emma, and these two men plead with her to go West with the Saints and bring her children as they were the heirs to the Throne.

Emma was pretty smart. She says: Well not only are they the heirs to the Throne, but I am the Queen on the Throne. If you'll let me be Queen and rule over the Church and Kingdom, I'll go with you — otherwise, forget it. But Emma despised the whole Gospel and had she received that honor, she would have done away with the Higher Laws of the Kingdom. So Emma's rights could not be considered. She stayed in Nauvoo, and in later years her son Joseph III became very resentful of President Young.

Joseph III, because of the negative influence of his mother, and ultimately because of what he became later (and I would say that for the most part, what he became later is a credit to himself, not to his mother) — but because of what he became later, when Joseph III was chosen as head of the Reorganized Church, he elected to devote its resources to ridicule, make mockery of, and put down the self same Principles for which his father had given his life in

order to restore and establish on Earth. He fought against Adam-God — he said far more against it than President Young ever did for it. He fought against Plural Marriage — he fought against Eternal Marriage — he denied the plurality of Gods — he denied the ordinances of the Temple and with them the Eternal Family. He also denied the Procreation of Spirits in the Preexistence. In essence, it was almost as though he were a Methodist who believed in the Book of Mormon. He became a lawyer (of all things) and he practiced Lawyer craft, in deceiving the Saints. He came out to Utah and interviewed Joseph Smith's plural wives, and then used lawyercraft in order to misrepresent their testimony. So he did everything which he could to oppose that which he was born heir to preside over in the Church. If Esau ever despised his birthright, Joseph Smith III did ten times more. He not only sold it, but he despised it too — he denied it, and he lost it.

While the Prophet lived, he had a bosom friend, and this man was Benjamin F. Johnson. He was a brother-in-law to the Prophet on several counts. Johnson's mother and brother and sisters joined the Church early on, and when Zion's camp went off to redeem Jackson County Missouri, his older brother Seth went with this camp. Benjamin F. Johnson was just a boy — he was too young to go — he wanted to go, but he was too young. But his brother Seth went — he honored his calling and received a blessing — but when he came back he got sick and died.

There was a promise of a blessing for the faithful who had gone with Zion's camp — they would have certain blessings. You know the quorum of the Twelve Apostles and the first quorum of the Seventy were filled by men who went on Zion's camp — the faithful men who went. Benjamin F. Johnson was sick at heart that his brother died — he was sick at heart that his brother never lived to receive his blessing. But Benjamin was given a blessing, and the Prophet promised that Benjamin would inherit the blessing that his brother Seth would have received if he had lived. Of course Benjamin was still young — when the Quorum of the Twelve and the Seventy were called, he was too young. But when the Council of

Fifty was organized, he became one of its youngest members and a member too upon whose head the Prophet prophesied special things. In a 1903 letter which Johnson wrote in response to queries from the First Presidency, after giving an account of the "last Charge" Johnson made the following statement:

> And now my dear brother after 60 years have passed at 85 in age I bear to you and to all the world a solemn testimony of the truth and verity of what I have written above; For although so many years have intervened, they are still in my mind as fresh as when they occurred; no doubt *as a part fulfillment of a prediction by the Prophet*, relating to *"Testimonies I should bear of his teachings after I had become Hoary with age"*. **There were dear brother other teachings to that Council** *of which I am not at full liberty to write*; But if I had your ear I would remember that **the Prophet once said to me** *"Benjamin in regard to those things I have taught you privately that are not yet for the public*, ***I give you the right***, *when you are so led* **to commit them to others** for you will not be led wrong in discerning those worthy of your confidence. (*UPR* 61:32–38, 42–45)

The above Prophesy speaks of two different occasions wherein the Prophet commissioned Johnson. The first concerns a "Prediction" which the Prophet made in the Council of Fifty, wherein he spoke of certain "Testimonies" concerning "teachings" of the Prophet which Johnson would bear after he "had become hoary with age". The second concerns a private discussion which Johnson had with the Prophet, wherein he was commissioned with authority to perpetuate the Doctrine and Priesthood of the Kingdom of God to a certain worthy individual when he was so led by the Spirit of God. This is known not only from the testimony of Johnson as written above, but also from the testimony of others who knew him. It is significant that Johnson was willing to speak of this private commission from the Prophet in general terms — and equally significant that the particulars of this commission was so secret and important that it remain a secret, that he was unwilling to speak of it in specific terms, even in a letter to the First Presidency of the Church. All he was willing to say was that it had to do with the Kingdom of God or Council of Fifty, and the Prophet had promised him, that when

it came time for him to fulfill his commission by perpetuating these things, that he would not be led wrong in discerning those worthy of his confidence. The fact that Johnson's commission had to do with the Keys of the Priesthood is self evident from his statement, that his relation of the Prophet's Last Charge and commission of the Keys of the Kingdom to the Council of Fifty was a partial fulfillment of the Prophet's prediction.

That the Prophet would put this commission and responsibility upon the shoulders of Benjamin Johnson is not surprising. Indeed, by the time of the organization of the Council of Fifty, the Prophet had already married several of Johnson's sisters. Not only this, but Johnson and the Prophet were business partners. They were so close that Benjamin was given power of attorney to sign the Prophet's name. Johnson became head over the second largest body of Saints in the Church. The Prophet was over Nauvoo, and Benjamin had control in Macedonia, which was across the river. Whenever the Prophet came over the river, he almost always stayed at Johnson's home. As George Albert Smith said, Benjamin F. Johnson was the Prophet's bosom friend. It was as though he were the Prophet's little brother. Not only that, but he was adopted to the Prophet as a son.

It was the Council of Fifty that actually received the "Last Charge" and the Twelve were members of this Council. In accordance with the policy established by President Young, the Twelve Apostles who personally lived and stood next to Joseph were first in line to rule over the Kingdom, standing in the Prophet's shoes or place, waiting for the birthright heir to come forward. Even though Emma refused to come, Brigham continued to maintain hope that her son David would receive the Gospel, and come out and be head over the Kingdom, in accordance with the Prophet's prophecy. Finally David grew up, and as a young man he came to Utah — he went amongst the Saints and Brigham saw to it that he got took in hand and introduced to his father's plural wives. He was shocked. All through the years from his childhood up, David was taught to believe that plural marriage was wicked — that it

was terrible — that Brigham Young was the one who brought it into the Church, and not his father — it was of the Devil. And now, all of a sudden, he finds out from so many witnesses that it was overwhelming, that his father was actually the one who introduced it among the Saints. He went back home in a quandary and he was committed to an insane asylum — and there he stayed until on the 29th of August 1904, when he finally died.

Now according to Heber C. Kimball, as long as there was one of the Twelve Apostles left, they would hold the Keys in preference to anyone else. The last man of the Twelve to die — and Heber was not talking about this perpetual quorum that is being filled, but he was talking about those of the Twelve who stood next to the Prophet while he lived — the Twelve in Joseph's day stood next to the Prophet and so did others — and as long as there was one of the quorum of the Twelve left, they would hold the Keys in preference to any of the others, who were not Apostles, but who had nonetheless stood next to the Prophet. The last member of the original quorum of the Twelve who had stood next to the Prophet was Wilford Woodruff. He died in 1898. After that, the last surviving man who had stood next to the Prophet in the Council of Fifty was Benjamin F. Johnson.

In 1896, Johnson blessed his grandson, to be the Prophet Joseph Smith's birthright heir. In accordance with the New and Everlasting Covenant, this grandson of Benjamin F. Johnson was also a grandson of the Prophet Joseph Smith.

Question: Could you explain that?

Answer: Joseph had proposed marriage — he had already married two or three of Johnson's sisters, and then he asked for another sister — Esther — she was Johnson's youngest sister. Benjamin Johnson said: I can't do it — she is already engaged to my brother-in-law. Joseph very reluctantly said: Well go ahead, let them marry, but it won't change anything, it will all work out in the end. In other words, she was going to be the Prophet's wife in eternity.

In like manner, there were also other women who were sealed to the Prophet for eternity. In his diary, William Clayton, tells of a woman that was supposed to be married to the Prophet, that later, he wanted to marry, and when he went to get the sealing, she couldn't be sealed to him for Eternity, but instead, she was sealed to Joseph. Another case is that of Rachel Ivins. The Prophet proposed marriage to her before she understood plural marriage. Her retort was, that she would not be any man's private whore, so she rejected his proposal. After the Prophet's death the Saints relocated in the West and Rachel Ivins received a revelation wherein she was told to go to Utah, and that a lot of men would come and ask to marry to her, and some of them would come out and say that 'if you marry me, I promise not to take a plural wife'. In her revelation she was told, don't marry anybody who says that, but instead, marry somebody who has more than one wife and who will live the Law. So, when she came to Utah, Jedediah M. Grant proposed marriage to her and she accepted. But when they went to Brigham Young to be sealed, President Young told them that he would seal them for time, but not for eternity, and that Rachel, along with her posterity would belong to the Prophet Joseph Smith after death. Oddly enough, one of her children was Heber J. Grant, the seventh President of the Church.

In 1882, they had a vacancy in the Quorum of the Twelve, and it was not filled during the Conference. Later, President John Taylor received a revelation calling Heber J. Grant to fill the vacancy, but after he received his calling, Grant began to feel like he wasn't worthy. He was a real young guy — about twenty three or twenty five. He didn't feel worthy to be an Apostle. He was carrying this guilt trip around, and he was out among the Indians on a reservation, and all of a sudden he had a vision open up to his view and he saw into Heaven. He saw the Prophet and others who were in council together, and they were talking about the fact that they should have filled the vacancy in the quorum of the Twelve at the Conference, but they had not. The Prophet began to lament that there was no one of his seed in any of the high quorums in the Church to represent him. He wished that he had seed, a son or someone to represent

him in the Priesthood. Jedediah Grant was dead, he had died years before and he was in this council and he spoke up and said, why don't you appoint my son Heber J. Grant, who is your son in accordance with the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage, to be an Apostle. Heber J. Grant was the Prophet's son — yet he was not a blood son — but he was a son by the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage. So on account of this, Heber J. Grant was called to the Apostleship. A revelation was given to John Taylor, and he was called to his position.

There are other examples — all I'm trying to do is point out that there are precedents. In the case of Abraham, he was faced with dying and going into the grave without a blood son, and as lamentable as it was, it says in Genesis that Abraham would have to appoint one of his servants who was born in his house to be his heir, because he had no son. That was the law — that is what Abraham would have done, had he not had a son. It's right in the Bible. The Old Testament also speaks of a man marrying his dead brother's wife that seed may be raised up to the dead. This is precisely what took place in the case of Esther Johnson — she along with all her children would belong to the Prophet in Eternity but she was married to another man while she lived in mortal life.

The Prophet's children through Emma despised their birthright — they denied and lost their rights to the Priesthood and with it their birthright. When it became so obvious that it was beyond denying — as of August, 1904, David was dead — Joseph III was an avowed enemy to the work of God and had dedicated decades of his life to vilifying the Fullness of the Gospel — and so in the face of all this, being head over the family Kingdom of the Prophet Joseph Smith, which was the Kingdom of God or Israel, Benjamin F. Johnson appointed Joseph Smith's birthright heir among one of his own grandsons. This grandson was also a descendant of Benjamin's sister Esther, and hence a grandson of Joseph Smith in accordance with the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage. Not only so, but he was a young man over whom Johnson had considerable influence.

According to family tradition, Johnson's sister Esther was sealed as a wife to the Prophet Joseph Smith in the Saint George Temple. There is a big stink that has been made about this, but there are no records in the Genealogical Library — I'll get into that a little later. We have the records where Joseph proposed marriage to Esther — we have records where this woman acted as a proxy wife for the Prophet in sealing several of her dead sisters to Joseph as wives — this is one record which was overlooked and consequently, it was not expunged. Years later, after 1956, when the sealing became an issue in the succession question, the record of the sealing of Esther to the Prophet was removed from the archives. There are in fact twelve women who were sealed to the Prophet, the records of which have been restricted and closed to research.

Benjamin F. Johnson gave a blessing to his grandson in 1896, appointing him to be the Prophet's birthright heir. In 1905 when Johnson died, He was the last surviving member of the Council of Fifty. In 1904, which was the same year that the Prophet's son David died, Johnson told his Grandson that when he (i.e. Johnson) died his Mantle would fall on his grandson as head over the Kingdom, which was the family of Israel. As the last surviving member of the original Council of Fifty, Johnson's Mantle constituted the "Keys of the Kingdom" or House of Israel — and according to his own statements, when he died "his mantle would fall on his grandson like the mantle of the Prophet Elijah fell on Elisha". This grandson's name was Alma Dayer LeBaron. As fate would have it, Dayer was one of those stalwarts who had the courage to continue the practice of Plural Marriage after the Manifesto, and he had a number of sons.

According to the teachings of Benjamin F. Johnson, the Priesthood and Mantle which he had given Dayer was not to come to the front and take affect until after the Times of the Gentiles had been fulfilled. Dayer lived to 1950 and he died a fairly early death. He was born in 1886. Before he died he ordained his son Wesley to all the Keys of the Patriarchal Priesthood which he had. Shortly afterwards, he told this same son to "go ahead with the patriarchal

work of the house of the Prophet Joseph Smith in his stead." After this, Alma Dayer went home to Mexico and had a stroke, and finally he died.

Wesley never went home with his father. He lived in Salt Lake, and his father lived down in Mexico. So he was not present in Mexico to witness what took place before his father died. I have been around the family, and I have interviewed the people and talked to those who were present as much as I could. When Dayer's oldest son, Benjamin, found out his father had a stroke, he took off for his fathers home — he came to get the birthright and the blessing. There was a rivalry between Wesley and Ben. As I have said, Dayer had already had a stroke before Benjamin went to receive his blessing. After the stroke, Dayer couldn't talk — you couldn't understand him — all he could do was have someone help him lift his hands and moan. After his visit with his father, Ben went home presuming and believing that he had the birthright. Wesley's mother had always favored Ben, who was her first born son, just like Isaac's wife favored Jacob over Esau. In any case, at that time she wrote to the effect that Dayer had given the birthright to Ben.

Aside from Wesley and Benjamin, there was no talk in the family about anyone else receiving anything from Dayer — at least not for years to come — in fact at the time of Dayer's death, there were only two of his sons that believed in and honored his Priesthood — all the rest had aligned themselves with the Fundamentalist movement — in particular the Allred group, and this included Maud — at least, this is so after Dayer's death. For them Dayer's life long claim to the mantle he had received from his Grandfather had only brought isolation and embarrassment to the family — not only from their friends in the Church but also among the Fundamentalists.

The interesting thing is that except for Dayer's two oldest sons, his children didn't understand what all this meant, and though it is true that the two older sons believed, at that early date, even they didn't comprehend the essence of their father's calling or the doctrine associated therewith. In 1944, Wesley thought being the birthright heir of the Prophet Joseph Smith was an honor without

responsibility, as there was no calling or office in the Church for the Prophet's heir. There was an office for the birthright heir of Hyrum, but not for the birthright heir of Joseph Smith. So Dayer had received the Keys, and the Birthright — but he refused to convey the knowledge or doctrine which he received in conjunction with it to his sons — at least this is so in the case of his younger sons. In other words he was just as secretive about his calling as had been his Grandfather before him

Joel and Ervil (notorious Ervil) they were two more of Dayer's sons and they never took their father's Priesthood seriously, at least, not while he lived. I have a document written by Ervil wherein he openly confessed his own feelings. He despised his Father for the Priesthood claims that he made, as it conflicted with the Fundamentalist Priesthood Doctrine which he then espoused.

In 1955, Joel came to Utah, and as I have said, Joel was one of Alma Dayer LeBaron's sons — he was Wesley's younger brother. He came to Utah to meet with Rulon Allred — he was in the Allred group, and he came to Utah to get funds from Rulon to start a United Order down in Mexico. While he was in Salt Lake, he stopped over to see his brother Wesley and it was through this association and meeting that he was finally informed and converted to the Priesthood calling and birthright which his father had received from Benjamin F. Johnson. When they were together, Wesley told Joel that the day would come when a Church would be established under the Keys and birthright that their father held. As of this time Wesley had received some revelation about it — and Joel asked him: "What will it be called?" Wesley replied, saying that it would be called "The Church of the Firstborn." Joel became very exuberant — he had come to Utah with the intention of obtaining funds to further organize the people in Mexico, but until now he had never supposed that it would involve the establishment of a new Church. "Well", he said, "lets go down and do it right now — lets go do it!" So they went down and incorporated "The Church of the Firstborn of the Fullness of Times."

In the minutes of the organization, as well as in the papers for the corporate sole, Wesley was sustained as the Presiding Patriarch and acknowledged as the head of the Church — in other words, originally two of Wesley's brothers — both Joel and Floren sustained Wesley as their Father's birthright heir. The Articles for the Corporate Sole which were filed with the State of Utah state the following:

ARTICLE VI: The succession of the presiding officer shall be to *a worthy son, or a near kin* until a worthy heir shall qualify ***according to the patriarchal law***, and the common consent of the church. (*A Reply to "The Church of the Firstborn of the Fullness of Times"*, by Henry W. Richards, pp. 2)

The minutes of the organization which were written in Floren LeBaron's hand state the following:

Sept. 21, 1955

500 North State
Sandy, Utah

Meeting held morning of the 21st of Sept. 1955 — presided o***ver by Ross W. LeBaron*** and prayer offered by Joel F. LeBaron in prayer circle being present Ross W. LeBaron, Joel F. LeBaron and Floren M. LeBaron. . . . . *The calling of Ross W. LeBaron received of his father as holding all the keys rites and authority of the patriarchal order of Priesthood was confirmed by patriarchs Joel F. and Floren M. LeBaron* ***to preside as head patriarch*** *in "the Church of the first born of the fullness of times,"* ***to hold all the patriarchal keys of this dispensation*** *held by the Prophet Joseph Smith and handed down to patriarch Benjamin F. Johnson by the prophet* and conferred upon the head of patriarch Alma D. LeBaron who conferred them on his sons." (Journal and Diary of The Church of the First Born of the Fullness of Times; *A Reply to "The Church of the Firstborn of the Fullness of Times*" by Henry W. Richards pp. 10–14)

There were three brothers involved in the original organization — Wesley, Joel and Floren. Shortly after this, even though they had sustained Wesley as the Presiding Patriarch, and head of the Church, both Floren and Joel decided that Joel should be the head

of the Church, instead of Wesley. So they went back and told Wesley that they were going to have a change and Joel was going to be the head of the Church. Wesley refused, of course, so there was a division. Even though the minutes of the organization and other legal papers show that Wesley was the head of the Church, and the Presiding Patriarch, and that succession in the Priesthood would be patriarchal, still the legal charter was in Joel's name, hence he had legal control, so he took it and ran with it. Consequently, shortly afterwards, Wesley went out and filed another charter under the name of "The Church of the Firstborn".

Joel began to claim that his father gave him his Grandfather's Mantle, together with the presiding office in the Priesthood, which he referred to alternately as "the Office of Moses" and "the Right of the Firstborn". What is ironic, is that Joel never lived to learn or understand what his Grandfather's Mantle was all about — nor did he ever understand the essence of the Right of the Firstborn, or the Highest Office in the Priesthood — nor for that matter the essence of the Church of the Firstborn. But not withstanding all this, he did get his brother Ervil to swear to it, and later he and Ervil even persuaded their mother.

I went down and interviewed Alma, who is one of the younger sons of Dayer, and an ardent disciple of Joel, and he told me over and over again — and I interviewed him for hours to get all the details — he stated over and over again to me, that he "never heard so much as a whisper about Joel ever receiving anything from his father until after Joel came back from Utah in 1955, when Joel and Wesley organized the church." That's the first that Joel's brother Alma ever heard anything about his father ordaining Joel to anything. Of course, Joel had no respect for his father's Keys anyway, at least not until five years after he died. But Wesley did, and so did Ben.

Ultimately the French Missionaries were converted to Joel's church, and then it began to grow by leaps and bounds — about 2000 people were converted. What they did is this — they organized a church that was just like the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day

Saints and then called it the "Church of the Firstborn of the Fullness of Times." Joel didn't know anything about what the Church of the Firstborn was — he didn't know anything concerning the things which we have talked about tonight. But what he did understand was the carnal Law of Moses, and so also did Ervil — hence the civil Law of Moses became the preoccupation of their doctrine, thought and faith and so it is to this day among their descendants.

Shortly after their organization and shortly before Joel's return to Mexico, Joel and Floren visited with Steve Kirkland, who lived in the vicinity of St. George. Kirkland was a giant of a man who at one time claimed to be the one Mighty and Strong. He had strange ideas about the Aaronic Priesthood and many of these ideas were adopted by Ervil and Joel and incorporated into their church as doctrine. Joel wrote his paper on Priesthood, or should we say that he had Ervil write it, and in the paper they threw out the challenge that the revelation of the doctrine on Priesthood that they taught and sent out to the world would prove that they were God's servants. They had Apostles and Seventies, and Stakes and so forth — their church was organized like the Church of Jesus Christ, but it was called the Church of the Firstborn. Perhaps the most novel idea in their doctrine was that the Aaronic Priesthood was in fact the Patriarchal Priesthood, and that the presiding birthright was inherited by Aaron and passed down through his descendants and finally given to father Smith, who passed the birthright of the Aaronic Priesthood to his son Hyrum. This doctrine is incredible in that it is as far from the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith, the Doctrine and Covenants and other Scripture as the East is from the West. In the *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, as well as in his revelations, which are recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants, the terms "Aaronic" and "Levitical" are used as alternate references for the same Priesthood. However Ervil and Joel both twisted the Prophet's doctrine and interpreted the Prophet's revelations and Teachings, to say that the "Aaronic Priesthood" and "Levitical Priesthood" were in fact two different orders. In essence, their doctrine was that the Levitical Priesthood was what is commonly understood to be the

Aaronic Priesthood in the LDS Church, with Bishops and etc., while at the same time they identified the Aaronic Priesthood which was conferred upon Aaron and his sons and restored in our day by John the Baptist — this Priesthood was identified as one and the same with the Patriarchal Priesthood which was inherited by the Prophet's brother Hyrum. In keeping with this doctrine, they identified the presiding office in the Aaronic Priesthood as one and the same with the office of the Presiding Patriarch in the Church.

I have a document written by Ervil, telling of when he was translating the *Priesthood Issue* (which is a Fundamentalist publication on Priesthood) into the Spanish language, and his father came over and saw what he was doing and told him not to do it. Then Ervil came out very rudely, according to his own statement and asked his father why not — whereupon his father responded by telling him that there were teachings in it (i.e. the publication: *The Priesthood Issue*) that were not correct. Ervil challenged his father to show anything in this pamphlet that wasn't right, but his father refused to teach him, saying that if the Lord wanted him to know about the Priesthood that he would receive the knowledge by personal revelation to himself. Ervil didn't respect his father's Priesthood and the doctrine which he and Joel later taught had nothing to do with what their father taught and certainly nothing to do with the scriptures — it's a total contradiction — it's wild. It's hard to understand how anybody could believe that the Aaronic Priesthood is the Patriarchal Priesthood. Their whole doctrine was screwy. Years later, even Ervil admitted to his disciples that he had found over one hundred doctrinal and historical mistakes in the pamphlet which he wrote on Priesthood. Yet notwithstanding this it is most ironic that he never did come to recognize the biggest mistake of all, namely his teaching that the Aaronic Priesthood was the Patriarchal Priesthood. It is significant too that for the most part, Ervil was the doctrinal authority and spokesman for the Church of the Firstborn of the Fullness of Times, not Joel.

After Joel became successful, Maud, who was Dayer's wife, testified that Dayer gave the Mantle to Joel. I know all this sounds bad. But I want to take you back to some earlier stories that are just like it — stories about Cain and Abel — and Jacob and Esau — and Joseph and his jealous brethren, who sold him into Egyptian slavery — and all this because of jealously over the birthright.

Years later, after Wesley and Joel separated, Joel made Ervil the next Church Patriarch, but it wasn't as the head of the Priesthood — it was under Joel. It wasn't very many years after that Ervil began to realize that he ought to preside as head of the church instead of Joel. Not only that, but they all had their noses rubbed into their false doctrine — so much so, that Ervil began to realize that it was not true, so he wanted to change the doctrine and correct it. But Joel wouldn't have it, so there became a split and in the end, things became so bad that Ervil had Joel killed for being a false Prophet.

After that, Ervil killed a bunch of other people, and he came to Utah and he and his people started laying out threats all over the Salt Lake valley, including at my door, or at least to me. Ervil published a Pamphlet with a red sword on the cover. Its kind of interesting that on the very day that I got a letter from my Stake President notifying me that I was due for a trial — on that very same day I also got a letter from Ervil or his people. This letter was written on the back of the book which they printed with a red sword on the cover and was addressed to three individuals, one of whom was myself. It was left on Wesley's garage door in Salt Lake City. In substance, the note on the cover threatened that we would be killed if we didn't pay tithing to Ervil.

Question: Is that when Ervil died?

Answer: No, he died a lot later than that — he went through a lot of bloodshed before he finally died. When Ervil went to prison his people continued to write letters to me. Of course, I did not appreciate being on their mailing list, but at the same time that Ervil was on trial, one day I got in my car, and it was right during the trial, and I went to drive down to Salt Lake, and as I was driving

down in Salt Lake, going south on Main Street, all of a sudden my steering wheel became disconnected from the tires. One of the ways that Ervil's people did their killings was to sabotage cars — they had crawled under my car, and pulled the cotter pin out of the castle nut, and unscrewed the nut so that it was just on enough to get me going down the freeway, when it was supposed to come off, but I managed to make it all the way into Salt Lake, on about 28th South and Main Street, when all of a sudden I started veering off to the right — I had no control of the car — the steering wheel was useless. I slammed on the brakes and slid into a new car lot — slid up to a brand new pick up truck — touched it and stopped dead in my tracks — I didn't even scratch the truck. I got under my car and looked at it, and I realized that that's not the kind of accident that happens — cotter pins are made to be safe — the car was sabotaged by Ervil's people, who intended to kill me.

I never met Ervil. I never laid eyes on him in my life — I never met Joel.

Question: Why did they want to kill you?

Answer: Well in 1971, there was a guy named Loyd Sullivan, who called in on talk radio and a friend of mine called him up and they got together, and I started to teach him. This friend of mine resented that, because he figured he was his contact. He didn't want me to teach him any more and I was asked by Wesley to leave him alone, so I stopped teaching him. I had consecrated my library, and this contact was looking through it one day, and he saw a pamphlet from Ervil and Joel's church and this guy took it — he read it and went straight to Mexico. A month or two later he came back up, called me up at my folks and wanted to meet with me. He told me what he had done — he had joined Joel and Ervil's Church down in Mexico and he wanted me to join up with him. I went down to meet him and totally blasted Joel and Ervil's doctrine. The next thing I know this man had joined up with Ervil and was involved with Ervil when Joel was killed — that's how I got on their mailing list.

Anyway, back to another parallel to all this murder and mayhem — you go back to the Old Testament and find out about how Cain

was jealous of Abel and so he murdered him. You read about how Jacob and Esau had a problem and Jacob took off to save his life. In all fairness to Esau though, we must admit that Jacob tricked his father in order to get Esau's blessing. Jacob had already bought the birthright from Esau. He did this one day when Esau was hungry and starving and wanted Jacob to give him something to eat, but before Jacob would feed him, first Esau must agree to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage. Years later it became time for Esau to receive the blessing, and so Jacob's mother dressed Jacob up in animal skins, so that Isaac would suppose that Jacob was Esau. Jacob's mother cooked him up some food and Jacob took it into his father under the premise that he was Esau. Inasmuch as Isaac was old and nearly blind, the whole trick worked, hence, Jacob received Esau's blessing. When Esau got back, he was pretty mad about what happened, so Jacob took off to save his life, and did not feel safe to return for fourteen years. Some kind of trick to pull!

You know, we can all look back in the Old Testament and say: "Well, we know that Jacob got the birthright" — but it wasn't so obvious back then. Hindsight is real good, but foresight isn't always so clear.

Later Jacob had twelve sons, and he favored someone who was not his firstborn — it was Joseph and all the other brethren resented it, so they decided to kill him. But Judah, being a true Jew, and the first Jew, figured out something better — he figured out a way to make a profit, so they decided to sell him into slavery instead.

Wayne Reeves: He believed in "Profits" you see!

Answer: Right, but he spelled it different. So you can see that in the Old Testament, there was contention over the birthright. The Prophet's revelation in Section 121 (verses 34–46) follows suit in family matters, just as it does in the Church, and it happened in the LeBaron family as well.

You see, originally, this birthright thing was not a matter for them of: "I'm the big it." In the beginning Dayer's sons didn't know what it was — they only knew that it was in the family and that they had it. In the early 40's Wesley thought being the birthright heir of

the Prophet Joseph Smith was an honor without responsibility. He believed this because there was no calling or office in the Church for the Prophet's heir. But this is not to say that Dayer was in ignorance. Dayer knew something about it, but when his son Ervil challenged him and asked for information, Dayer refused to teach him. He told Ervil that if the Lord wanted him to have that knowledge, that the Lord would reveal it to him, otherwise he would not find out, for he (i.e. Dayer) was not going to say. Well, because of this Joel and Ervil wrote up all kinds of crazy doctrine.

As for Wesley, it was not until he received further revelation concerning the Church of the Firstborn and its relationship to the House of Israel, that he finally realized the essence of the calling to be the Prophet's birthright heir. As of this time Wesley believed that the Patriarchal Office was the Highest Office in the Church, and this would be so, whether in the Gentile Church of Christ or the Israelite Church of the Firstborn.

It was not until 1967, that Wesley finally came to understand that there were two basic orders of the Melchizedek Priesthood — that one was restored by Peter, James and John, and the other by Moses, Elias and Elijah, and that that which was restored by Peter, James and John was for the Priesthood which was after the Order of the Son of God and had to do with the Church of Christ, and that the Priesthood which was restored in the Kirtland Temple was inherently a Patriarchal Priesthood which was properly referred to as the Holy Order of God and that that Priesthood pertained to the Church of the Firstborn. It was not until Wesley came to this understanding that he finally realized in a comprehending way that he had received the Keys to the Highest authority in the Priesthood when his father blessed and ordained him to the Patriarchal Priesthood and gave him the charge to go ahead with the Patriarchal work in his stead. Yet, this notwithstanding, Wesley had believed for at least seventeen years that when Elijah appeared in the Kirtland Temple he restored Patriarchal Priesthood.

I met Wesley about three years after he came to understand the High Priesthood after the Holy Order of God, and shortly after, on

August 10th, 1970, I was expressly ordained to all the keys that were restored in the Kirtland Temple by Moses, Elias and Elijah. From that time on, I began to do missionary work and to teach. It is a long 22 year history, the details of which I don't care to tell tonight — I don't feel that it is necessary. If I ever get to know you better, I'm sure you will hear the other details. At that time, I gave my life to that man, and the work I received through him became the work of my whole life.

Shortly after I was ordained I began to receive revelations about what the Church of the Firstborn was. Wesley did not yet know that. He knew that the Church of the Firstborn was a Patriarchal Order and he knew that the Church of Christ wasn't, and he knew about the Times of the Gentiles and the Times of Israel and that the Times of Israel was come in. He also knew about the Patriarchal Priesthood, but notwithstanding the difference in the nature of their organization, as of that time (in his mind) the Church of the Firstborn and the Church of Christ both served the same basic purpose. In other words, their basic difference was not yet revealed to him, other than that one was Patriarchal and the other was not.

Shortly after meeting Wesley, I was teaching a friend — I had met this person before I was married — he was the Bishop's son in my parents ward and a descendant of Benjamin F. Johnson. I was teaching him about the things I had recently learned about the Gospel and he said: Well Fred, why would God set up two Churches? This was in 1970, and I answered him saying: I don't know, except for the fact that one is a Patriarchal Order and the other is not — one is for a Patriarchal era, and the other is not. That knowledge I had gained from Wesley. This friend of mine responded, saying: Well you know, I don't see why God would set up two different Churches to accomplish the same work — why would He make them different?

I didn't really feel comfortable about the answer which I gave him on that occasion, so I went to Wesley and asked, but I only got a repeat of the same answer which he had already given. It wasn't long after that, that I received a revelation that the Church of Jesus

Christ was for the Salvation of mankind, while the Church of the Firstborn was for the Exaltation of man, and that the family related Temple ordinances had to do with the Church of the Firstborn — while Baptism, the Sacrament and the other ordinances had to do with the Church of Christ. From that time on I began to receive revelation about the Church of the Firstborn and the Priesthood.

I wasn't very well read — reading was difficult for me and I didn't like to read. In school, I was the worst reader in my class. This made reading the scriptures difficult, especially with the old English in them, so I did not read much of the Scriptures. Still I liked to think about the Gospel. From the time I was fourteen, I always thought it was real neat that God was my Father — that was the neatest thing that I knew. I always wanted to teach it to my friends in school. Still I didn't read the Scriptures much, and I didn't read much of other things either. But when I got married, I did start reading about Joseph Smith — in 1969 I read all the biographies that I could buy in the bookstore about Joseph — all excepting the one by Brodie. After starting into this book, I soon recognized her bias and lost interest. I have never read the *Journal of Discourses* or the *History of the Church* — at least not from cover to cover.

In any case, when I had this revelation about the Church of the Firstborn, and the ordinances of the Temple being the ordinances of the Church of the Firstborn — shortly afterwards I was talking one day with a man that had been involved with the work thirteen years before me. He argued against what I had received and he said he had a statement that would prove that I was wrong. So he pulled out his notebook — I guess he had collected most everything he could find which referred to the Church of the Firstborn — and then he read this statement to me on the phone. The statement which he read comes from the *Journal of Discourses*, Volume 8, page 154, where Brigham Young said:

> The ordinances of the House of God are expressly for the Church of the Firstborn. (*JD* 8:154)

Rather than contradicting what I had received, this statement confirmed it. And so, line upon line, precept upon precept, the Lord began to give me revelation about The Church of the Firstborn — I continued to receive revelation about it, and I started to dig into the history and gradually I began to find things to support those things that were given me by revelation.

In 1970, through the inspiration of the Spirit, I had come to the conclusion that the Prophet Joseph Smith had conferred the Patriarchal Priesthood on the members of the Holy Order on May 4th, 1842, when he gave them their endowments. It was my belief that the Prophet then anointed them Kings and Priests, and through that means conferred on them the Patriarchal Priesthood, but until 1973, I had no hard evidence or any black and white statement to prove it. During that year, at the instance of Max Anderson, if I remember correctly, I went to the home of Michael Marquart and talked to him about the Patriarchal Priesthood, telling him as I did so what I believed. He did not completely understand my beliefs, but he did remember reading one statement by George Miller who was one of the original 10 members of the Holy Order. Miller had kept a diary, and later wrote a letter wherein he spoke of what took place on May 4th and 5th, 1842. Marquart pulled this document out of his files and gave it to me and much to my delight, I discovered that Miller had recorded the following statement regarding the Prophet's May 4th 1842 meeting:

> Many of the Apostles and elders having returned from England, Joseph *Washed and anointed as **Kings** and **Priests**,* as he said he was commanded of God, *and conferred on us **Patriarchal Priesthood**.* (see *The Diaries and Writings of Bishop George Miller*, to be published in a forth coming issue of *Doctrine of the Priesthood*)

When I first read this statement, I jumped for joy — I went into the clouds for happiness, and I did not come down for weeks — and to this day when I think of it, I still remember the perfect excitement, euphoria and happiness that finding this statement brought me. It

was a vindication of what the Spirit of Revelation had revealed to me, as well as what I had believed and fervently taught to all who would hear me for more than three years, ever since my introduction to the work in 1970.

I learned about Adoption right after my ordination. Wesley knew about Adoption when I first met him — what he knew was that Benjamin F. Johnson was adopted to Joseph Smith and so were others, but he did not understand the purpose, essence or significance of the doctrine. I learned about this right after my ordination. I was interested in information on Benjamin F. Johnson being adopted to Joseph, when I overheard Harry Russel telling Wesley about the section on "Sealing Men to Men" in one of Tanners early publications, "Changes in Mormonism Vol. 1". Shortly afterwards, I discovered for myself the Stanley Ivins Collection at the Utah State Historical Society, which contained a substantial file on the subject of Adoption. This was in 1970.

When I got hold of the John D. Lee report of President Young's February 16th and 17th, 1847 family meeting, it was like revelation from Heaven — *it was revelation from Heaven* — the Spirit of God came upon me and the horizons of my mind were expanded.

Years later Gordan Erving was appointed by Leonard Arrington to write a paper on the subject of adoption and ultimately this paper was published in the spring 1974 issue of *BYU Studies*. The major source for Erving's paper was the Stanley Ivins collection, and unbeknonst to him, he learned of these materials through a friend of mine with whom I had shared them several years before, when in the process of teaching him about Adoption as practiced in the Church of the Firstborn.

As far as information concerning the Church of the Firstborn is concerned, the rich period was during the Nauvoo sojourn, and shortly afterwards, during the early pioneer period. After that the Twelve began to hide the doctrine of the Kingdom. They knew that the birthright belonged to Joseph's children, but Emma was apostate and so were her kids. In order to protect the Kingdom, they had to hide the knowledge of the Patriarchal Priesthood, so they buried

it. Hence, we have the Church today — they don't know anything about it. But low and behold — big surprise — all of a sudden things start jumping off the page, and things too that have great meaning, especially when understood in the light of revelation, but which did not mean anything before or without the Spirit.

When I came into the work in 1970, the big IT thing about Priesthood was the Apostleship and Apostolic Succession. Relatively speaking, in the minds of those who were supposed to be informed, the Patriarchal Priesthood had no jurisdiction or presidency. When you become a Stake Patriarch — you give blessings, and usually this is when you are an old man. The common understanding was that a Patriarch didn't have the right to govern the Church of Christ or anything else. And the Church of the Firstborn — that was just some pie in the sky about which no one knew anything.

You know, today, there are a lot of things available, but in 1970, there wasn't hardly anything except the History of the Church, The Teachings of Joseph Smith and the Scriptures. In 1970 the diaries of Joseph Smith were not available for research and none of the manuscripts from which the History of the Church was composed were available either. As for those portions which had been published in the History — most of them had been edited, so as to hide the existence and essence of the Holy Order and Council of Fifty.

When David O. McKay died, Joseph Fielding Smith changed places and became President of the Church — before this he was the Historian of the Church and he had the archives locked down. But when he became President, I guess the guys that succeeded him in the historical department weren't smart enough to know that there were things that they needed to hide. So they appointed one of these professional Historians to be over the Historian's office — a new Church Historian — Leonard Arrington. Arrington hired a whole crew of guys and these, along with the newly hired staff in the archives came in and began to organize the Historical papers of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young etc., and for a very short period, they would let people into the archives to see documents which always before had been restricted.

I had already been up to see — its kind of interesting — about a year or two before I met Wesley I had a revelation that the best way to teach the Gospel to the masses was to entertain people while you teach them, so I wanted to write a historical novel on the life of Joseph Smith, and tell the good and the bad, the whole story. I went up to the archives at that time and asked to do research and Loritz Peterson refused to allow me to have access to the documents.

Comment: Loritz Peterson lives right here in town.

Continuing: Does he?

Comment: Yes he lives right here in town.

Continuing: So I say — well I knew all about Church organization — first of all I knew I was right — I had received a revelation on it and they were bound to let me in — God told me — so I asked Br. Peterson: "Who is your boss?" I knew all about the principle of the chain of command and "correlation" in the Church, which at that time was clearly taught. I had been taught that if you have a problem, first you go to your home teachers, then if not satisfied, to your Bishop, Stake President, and so continue working up through the Hierarchy until the problem is resolved. Anyway, I asked who his boss was, and Br. Peterson told me that Earl Olsen was, so I went to Earl Olsen and told him the whole story — I've got to see these papers — I've got to do this book.

He says: "No, you can't do that".

I said: "Well who is your boss?"

He said: "Joseph Fielding Smith".

This was before David O. McKay had died. So I went to see Joseph Fielding Smith and told him about the revelation I had received and asked him to allow me in to see the manuscripts, but he said, "No, we already have enough written on Joseph Smith and we don't need any more".

I asked him: "Would you pray about it?"

He said: "Why should I, I have already made up my mind."

Those were his very words.

I also wanted to go on a mission for the Church at that time — I was married — I was married in the Logan Temple when I

was eighteen and I wanted to go on a mission, and I wanted to take my wife with me. He said "Well, if you do that, you'll have to go in one place, and your wife in another, and you will have to be separated and you will have to be able to pay for your mission, and hers too, without help from the Church. I asked him why can't we go together? He said: Pregnant lady missionaries don't look very good. So that was out.

I even tried to go to David O. McKay in order to get permission to do research in the archives, but I never could get in to see him — I never got passed his secretary, who at that time was Joseph Anderson.

The next thing you know, I was involved with the Fullness of the Gospel and I finally found a way to get into the archives and get stuff copied. I got thousands upon thousands of pages of documents out of the archives. All of the Joseph Smith papers — Joseph Smith's diaries and his manuscript speeches. I got the manuscript speeches out and gave copies to a guy — a guy named Andy Ehat, and about a year later he came out with *The Words of Joseph Smith*. I then asked if he would return the copies but he said that he wanted to use them for volume two. Years later just before going into court at his trial with the Tanner's I asked him to return them again, but he said that he already had. No doubt he did this under advisement.

At Ehat's trial the lawyer for the Tanner's tried to soft soap me in order to get me to testify to having given Andy materials which had come from outside "legitimate" channels. My response to him was that the Tanners and I did not sit on the same side of the fence and so I refused to help them. To give insult to this, not more than an hour or so later, Ehat took the stand and as I stared him in the face he testified that he had betrayed our friendship. Of course the source of the manuscript copies from which he produced *The Words of Joseph Smith* was never revealed — I could have stood up and testified, but as I saw it, Andy's betrayal did not change the fact that me and the Tanner's did not and could not sit on the same side of the fence.

I got the diaries of Wilford Woodruff out, and Signature Book printed them. They also printed the diaries of Joseph Smith. Unfortunately I shared the Joseph Smith Diaries and revelations with people, and I shared them with one guy and he took them right down to the Tanners, and the next thing you know, the Tanners were first to print the diaries and the manuscripts of the Prophet's Revelations. That's kind of how these things got out. After this experience I was not so free in giving out copies of the manuscripts which I got out of the Archives.

When I was first ordained, I wanted to start writing on the Priesthood, but Wesley didn't want me to do that as he intended to do it himself. He said: If you want to work on something, work on Adam-God. Fine, I went to work on Adam-God. I spent years and years, and that was the reason — you haven't seen most of the work that I have done on Adam. There are several books which I have compiled, and besides these, several manuscripts which I have written, that have never been published. Over the years, most of these have been copied and widely circulated among scholars and students of Church history. For the most part, these unpublished manuscripts formed the research basis for Elwood Noris' anti-Adam-God book, *Be Not Deceived* — for Culley Christensen's book, *The Adam-God Maze* — as well as the two papers on Adam-God which were printed in *Dialogue* Magazine — one by Gary Berjera and the other by David Burger. Both directly and indirectly, they, together with other materials which I have since published have also formed the research basis for most of Craig Tholson's book *Adam-God*.

In about 1974, I was down at the Tanner's Book store — from time to time I would go there to see what was the latest thing out from the anti-Mormon press. In about 1974 I met Wes Walters down there. He was a minister — a Presbyterian Minister and he wrote some pamphlets against the First Vision and other things. In our conversation I told him about two books which I had written on Adam-God, which had not yet been published. One was 400 pages and the other 250 and they were filled with hundreds of pages of

heretofore unpublished discourses, diary entries and other materials on the Adam-God doctrine. Being somewhat naive, I told him that I would let him make photo copies, if he would promise not to allow copies to be made and if he would keep them to himself. He made the promise, so I gave him copies. But once he had read them, he realized the important use that could be made of them in anti-Mormon polemics, and so he allowed some of his friends to see them and make copies. Copies of these manuscripts spread in all directions, and proliferated throughout the English speaking world. As a consequence of these newly discovered materials, the focus of the anti-Mormon world on the Adam-God doctrine increased more than a thousand percent. You could not go to conference without having anti-Adam-God tracts being pushed on you by Born Again Protestants who were standing outside the gates. I soon learned from this that God even uses His enemies to His own good purposes — as I lacked the means to spread the word ever so far as they had done, and even though some left the Church over this issue, there were many who received the doctrine.

Not long after this, myself and one of my Adopted sons were visiting his Stake President, and the topic of Adam-God came up and the Stake President stated that it was false doctrine and that the living prophet had spoken against it. I challenged him to show one statement where the Current living President of the Church, who was then Spencer Kimball had said so much as one word against the Adam-God doctrine. His response was that President Joseph Fielding Smith had said plenty, and that it had been printed in the Priesthood manuals of the Church. At this, I pointed out to him that Joseph Fielding Smith was just as dead as Brigham Young, and consequently, that even at best, his words were of no more value than President Young's, as both were dead and that Spencer W. Kimball had never said anything against the doctrine of Adam-God. It was most significant to me that at the very next Conference, Spencer Kimball himself stood up and spoke against the Adam-God doctrine, explicitly stating that, he along with the other current leaders of the Church "denounce" it, and "cautioned"

the Saints "against this and other kinds of false doctrine." I mention these things to give you a small sample of my life's activities for the last 22 years.

As I have said, shortly after my ordination in 1970, I started to write things on Priesthood, but Wesley requested that I not do this, saying that he himself intended to write on that subject, so he encouraged me instead to work on the Adam-God doctrine. For this reason during the early 70s I did not write much on Priesthood, nevertheless, the doctrine of the Patriarchal Priesthood and Succession was the focal point of my missionary endeavors. Consequently, commencing from the very beginning, I was always teaching and researching the subject. In 1970 I met a guy who worked in the manuscripts department at the University of Utah Library, and I began to prosylite him. We met weekly and I taught him about the Adam-God doctrine, the Church of the Firstborn, the Patriarchal Priesthood, the Holy Order of God, Succession, and etc. Not long afterwards, he moved out of state and we began to correspond, we started working together and I sent him research materials on the Holy Order, the Priesthood and Succession. Following this he wrote up an article on that subject which was submitted to *BYU Studies* for publishing.

For the most part, with the exception of Hyrum Andrus, at the early time of which I speak, the things which I had to say were laughed and jeered at among scholars. It was not until 1974 that scholars began to sit up and take serious notice of my ideas. The cause of this change of thought was due to the above mentioned paper on the Holy Order and Succession which was written and submitted to *BYU Studies* for publication in 1974. This paper was written 8 years prior to Ehat's thesis — it was written by a friend of mine whom I had been teaching since 1970, and was based upon research which I had sent him, including extracts from the Prophet's diary of all references to the Holy Order. Once this paper was written, and sent to the office of *BYU Studies*, it began to circulate among scholars, and except for the fact that this friend acknowledged me as his source, it would have been Published. It

just would not do for an "apostate" to bring out new revelation and understanding, especially when it undermined the authority of the quorum of the Twelve!

By 1976, even Apostle Mark E. Peterson had heard something about the Priesthood of the Holy Order, namely that within that organization there was a Priesthood Order which was above that of the President of the Church. In one of our conversations I mentioned to brother Peterson that I had studied the Priesthood a great deal more than Adam-God. When I told him this, he responded by saying, "Oh really — is there really a Priesthood Order above the President of the Church." "Yes", I told him, "it had to do with men who were anointed Kings and Priests and given the Sealing Keys in the Holy Order." And then, much to my surprise, he asked me: "Would you teach me about this Priesthood." I promised him that I would on our next visit, but shortly afterwards, I moved to Boise Idaho, and by the time that I returned, he had heard that I had taken a plural wife. He already knew that I was excommunicated, as he had participated in bringing about my trial. It was after my excommunication that we ran into each other at the University of Utah Hospital, when he was getting treated for cancer, and we became friends. But when he learned that I had taken a plural wife, he asked me if it was so, and when I said that it was — after this we did not communicate much any more.

Over the years many writers have benefited through my research and teachings — but due to my status with the Church, even if they had had a mind to, and very few of them have — they have been unwilling to acknowledge me as the original source of their ideas and information. These include Hyrum Andrus in his book "Doctrine of the Kingdom" — Michael Quinn in the second publication of his paper on the Joseph Smith III blessing and succession — Andrew Ehat in his 1982 thesis on the Holy Order/Council of Fifty and the Fullness of the Priesthood — Ronald Esplin in his dissertation and some of his other writings — and Gordon Erving in his paper on Adoption. Of these only Esplin was thoughtful enough to ask permission to use my materials or to acknowledge

me as his source — however, later when in a more discrete mode of thought, he found a safer and more appropriate source in Andrew Ehat, and so, ultimately Ehat was credited as the first to bring out the knowledge of the Fullness of the Priesthood in its relationship to succession — and this too, notwithstanding the fact that I had been teaching it for twelve years before the publication of Ehat's thesis, and had published a small introductory pamphlet on the subject four years earlier.

Andrew Ehat was a young man, a few years younger than myself. He came to BYU in the early 70s, when he enrolled in one of Hyrum Andrus' classes. I first met him in 1973. Through his association with Andrus, he became interested in the Holy Order, the Council of Fifty, Adoption, and the Fullness of the Priesthood, etc., but his introduction to these principles came several years after my own, and as I have said, through an association which he had with Andrus who was his teacher.

One incident which happened between myself and Ehat is interesting. One day in 1976, Ehat and I were both walking up the sidewalk towards the BYU extension center in Salt Lake, when in somewhat of a questioning mode he stated: "I was the first person to make extracts of all the meetings of the Holy Order from Joseph Smith's diaries." In response to this remark, I told Ehat that: "I have been doing research on the Holy Order since 1970. I tried to get into the archives for years, but on the very first day that I was allowed into the archives, the very first material that I requested was the diaries of Joseph Smith. And what I did on that first day was make complete extracts of all the materials in Joseph Smith's Nauvoo diaries, on the meetings of the Holy Order." This took place in 1973 and it was before Ehat had ever got involved. In continuing, Ehat further stated: "I was the first one to ever read the Sydney Rigdon Trial understandingly, or to comprehend it for what it was." In response to this remark, I told him that I had "first read the Rigdon Trial in 1970 — I read it out of the *Times and Seasons*, and at that time, I marked up all the significant extracts pertaining to the Holy Order and Fullness of the Priesthood and shortly afterwards I copied

these extracts into my research journal, a photograph copy of which I donated to the Church archives in 1973."

Ehat is a good scholar and does his own work and research, but his interest in these things came about several years after my own, and ultimately the original kernel of his idea came to him through my work and research. My interest commenced in 1970 at the time of my ordination. I personally introduced this same idea to both Andrus and Ehat, however it is possible that Ehat was exposed to the idea through Andrus before I met him.

But all this aside, a reading of Ehat's work will reveal that his writings are flawed by his bias for the Church. The necessary premise of succession to the Twelve has shaded his vision and formulated his opinions, thus preventing him from making an honest assessment of historic facts. A good example of this is found in the footnotes of his book where he discusses the "Patriarchal Authority" which is referred to in the Prophet's August 27th, 1843 discourse (*WJS* 245, 303–304). On this occasion Ehat attempts to defend the doctrine of apostolic succession by explaining away Abraham's Patriarchal Priesthood. It goes without saying that the High Order of the Patriarchal Priesthood presents damning problems to the doctrine of Apostolic succession to the Twelve. In order to get around this problem, Ehat explained the Patriarchal Priesthood away as some kind of nebulous authority which a man receives when he enters the eternal marriage covenant. In substance Ehat compromised his integrity for the sake of the living "brethren". Some how his work had to tie things down for the Twelve, even though, in fact, the Prophet's doctrine took things in an altogether different direction. In his thesis, Ehat presents his ideas about apostolic succession in a series of Mickey Mouse diagrams and circles, wherein he presents the idea that only the Twelve had it all. You might just as well argue that a man who had formerly been president of the Priest's quorum would thereby have the right to preside over the Twelve, when years later he just happened to get elected to that quorum. The truth is, at the time of the Prophet's death, the power was vested in the Quorum of the Fifty, who with the exception of

two gentile members had been given all the Keys and Fullness of the Priesthood and who had received the Last Charge. Being an Apostle did not in itself give any special status in the Council — at least, not before the Prophet died. Nor was the Fullness of the Patriarchal Priesthood or its control restricted to the Quorum of the Twelve. The Twelve had no more rights to it than any other faithful Elder. By the law of the Priesthood the presiding office in that Priesthood went to the Prophet's birthright heir and had nothing whatsoever to do with the Apostleship. Not only so, but had the original plan been followed through, all other seats in that Council would have descended from father to son as well. But the Council of Fifty was a secret Organization, while the Twelve were public, and after the Twelve succeeded in gaining control of the Church, the next move was to "swallow the Fifty" (*BYU Studies* Vol. 20: <Winter 1980> 175–176) and control it also. That is what happened and under the circumstances it is what the Lord wanted to happen — nevertheless, these unexpected circumstances had nothing whatsoever to do with the divine plan and the Law of Succession in the Patriarchal Priesthood. Ehat could have set these facts forth in all plainness in his thesis, but for the reason of other ulterior motives, he chose not to.

In continuing in this same vain, Ronald Esplin wrote his dissertation on the quorum of the Twelve, and wrote an article which was published in *BYU Studies*. In this paper he also endeavored to tie succession to the Twelve. In doing this he made use of a typescript which he received from Andy Ehat, wherein it was stated that the Twelve had universal jurisdiction both in and outside of Zion. According to Ehat's typescript, the Prophet was *supposed* to have said this in a meeting with the Quorum of the Twelve, the First Presidency, the Patriarch and others on May 27th, 1843. Ehat produced this typescript from the diary of Levi Richards, and for the desire of reading something into it which was not there, he transposed the word "but" into "and" (*BYU Studies* Vol. 20 <Summer 1981> p. 312), which beautifully reversed the meaning of the document into just what he wanted it to say. Unfortunately, Esplin

never checked Ehat's work and so he made leaps and bounds and all kinds of mileage off of a bad typescript and by this means he made his point. The truth is, the word is obviously "but". Not only so, but both William Clayton and Wilford Woodruff recorded a far more comprehensive account of the same meeting and both of these accounts make it very clear that the Prophet did not say what Ehat put into his mouth. Quite to the contrary, what the Prophet said was that the jurisdiction of the Twelve was limited to the mission field and that the High Council of the Church had jurisdiction in Nauvoo and Zion. This is precisely the same doctrine which is set forth in the Doctrine and Covenants (D&C 107:23, 33–35, 98); see also *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 7, No. 10, pp. 10–12), and while the Prophet lived, he never varied from this position. While he lived, Apostolic succession never entered the Prophet's mind — at least there is no document in existence which was written down before he died that would indicate that he did, and as we have seen, aside from this, there is a tremendous amount of material which would argue to the contrary.

I was the first to understand and give open discussion to the Fullness of the Priesthood, the Holy Order, and their relationship to the succession crisis of 1844. There had been a great deal written on succession before my time, but until 1970, no one had understood or thought to connect the issue of succession with the Fullness of the Priesthood and Temple ordinances which the Prophet was administering to the members of the Holy Order and Council of Fifty. Indeed, as far as current scholarship is concerned, before 1970, no one understood what the Fullness of the Priesthood was, nor had they heard of the Holy Order. Joseph Fielding Smith had mentioned the Fullness of the Priesthood in some of his writings, and occasionally his son-in-law, Bruce R. McKonkie parroted his thoughts, but neither of these men ever connected it to Succession or the Hierarchy of the Priesthood, much less to Patriarchal succession through the Prophet Joseph Smith's birthright Heir.

In 1966, Hyrum Andrus clearly expressed his ideas about the status of the Patriarchal Priesthood in his book the Doctrinal

Commentary of the Pearl of Great Price. Therein he stated that the Patriarchal Priesthood was basically the same as the Melchizedek Priesthood, except that it was organized in a patriarchal capacity. He also wrote that the Patriarchal Priesthood would always be under the jurisdiction of the non patriarchal branch of the Melchizedek Priesthood. In other words, he thought that the non patriarchal order of the Priesthood would always preside. Andrus' opinion was the typical understanding among scholars at the time his book was published and it continued to be so for years yet to come. It is interesting that even though Andrus believed that the Patriarchal Order was the Celestial Order which would exist in the highest degree of Celestial Glory — yet in his mind (and in accordance with current Church doctrine) he still found it necessary to believe that the Patriarchal Priesthood was under the jurisdiction of the Apostleship which is not a Patriarchal Priesthood. How can you have an eternal family and Patriarchal Order and then place the Patriarchs under the jurisdiction of others who are not in the family? It is a contradiction of terms.

I met Hyrum Andrus in 1971. I was introduced to him through the efforts of my friend Royden Johnson, who had taken classes from him at BYU. Inasmuch as Andrus often addressed the subject of the Celestial Patriarchal Order in his classes, and inasmuch as that same subject was also a preoccupation of my mind as the inherent order of the Church of the Firstborn — which as I then understood it, was a Church organized in a Patriarchal capacity, through the Eternal Family Related Covenants of the Temple, and governed by the Patriarchal Priesthood, through the channel of Birthright Heirs in the Family — because of these common interests, my friend felt that some good might come from a meeting between myself and Andrus, and so he spoke to him about me, and I called him on the phone and went to see him. The first thing I did was challenge Andrus on his statement which he wrote in his commentary about the Patriarchal Priesthood being under the jurisdiction of the Melchizedek Priesthood. In defense of what he had written, Andrus pulled out a copy of *The Teachings of the*

Prophet Joseph Smith and quoted the Prophet's discourse on the Three Grand Orders of Priesthood which is found on page 322, wherein the Prophet said that "Melchizedek had power and authority over that of Abraham, holding the Key and Power of Endless Life". In responding, I pointed out how odd it seemed to me that he would believe that the Patriarchal Order was the order of life which would exist in the Highest Degree of Celestial Glory, and yet still believe that the Patriarchal Priesthood would come under the jurisdiction of a lesser order.

As the future would witness, through the arguments which I presented to him on that day, Andrus was convinced that he was wrong. At that time, I pointed out to him that Melchizedek presided over Abraham on several counts. For one, Abraham had received his priesthood from Melchizedek, and it was only natural that Abraham should answer to the man through whom he had received his Priesthood — for two, Melchizedek was Shem who was Noah's birthright heir — and this being so, Melchizedek was the Royal Patriarch through whose loins Abraham and the whole chosen race had descended. Hence, not only was Melchizedek a Patriarch to Abraham, but he was the Presiding Patriarch, Priest and King over the whole Church and Kingdom of God on Earth. As such, after the death of Noah, Melchizedek presided by birthright over the "Key and Power of Endless Lives", which constitute the Patriarchal Sealing Powers, through which Priesthood all faithful Patriarchs seal upon their posterity the *Family Related* blessings which pertain exclusively to the Highest Degree of Celestial Glory.

Furthermore, and thirdly, the Prophet did not say that Melchizedek presided over Abraham by virtue of being President of the Church or President of the High Priesthood, or an Apostle, but rather, by virtue of being a King and Priest which constitutes two offices in the Patriarchal Priesthood, and by virtue of holding the "Key and Power of Endless Lives", which authority constitutes what in our day, is commonly referred to as the "Sealing Keys of Elijah". Both the offices of King and Priest and the Sealing Keys are conferred through the ordinances of the Temple, namely the

Endowment and Second Anointing and these ordinances do not pertain exclusively to the First Presidency — nor do the offices of Kings and Priests and the Sealing Keys have any inherent relationship to the office of the President of the Church or the President of the High Priesthood of the Church. As I would come to understand years later, statements to the contrary are misleading half truths which were got up with an ulterior motive — namely to sustain the idea of "Apostolic succession" — which was an after thought that occurred in the minds of certain influential men after the death of the Prophet Joseph Smith. The fact that the Sealing Keys of Elijah are not inherent to the office of the First Presidency is proven by the fact that the office of President of the Church existed in the Church for years before the Sealing Keys of Elijah were restored and before any Kings and Priests were "Anointed".

Through this and other subsequent conversations, Andrus learned about the Fullness of the Patriarchal Priesthood. He gained a new understanding of the status of the Patriarchal Priesthood in the Hierarchy of the Priesthood, and came to understand its relationship to the Prophet's birthright heir. Not only so, but he also learned that what he had written in his previous book was not altogether in accordance with the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith, and a great deal of this new understanding, insight, and change of thought was reflected in his forthcoming book *Doctrine of the Kingdom*, which he printed two years later, in 1973. Yet in all this there was no acknowledgment to the original source of many of his innovative ideas, nor for the documents which he had received through my research Journal and etc. which I allowed him to copy, and which contained over three hundred pages of research material, much of which pertained to the Patriarchal order.

Another principle which I introduced Andrus to at that early date was the Law of Adoption. Not only did I teach him about it, but I also gave him research materials. As Andrus expressed himself at that time — years before he had gone through and read all the pioneer journals, etc. which were then available to him, including the John D. Lee diaries, but he did not at that time have the neces-

sary back ground and knowledge to understand what he read, and so he read over these things without notice or understanding.

Within the last two years, D. Michael Quinn, who has written extensively on the Priesthood and Succession, has made similar statements to me, namely, that through prejudice and the tradition which he received as a member of the Church, he had read over many documents without understanding them and that many of these oversights, had of late, been clarified in his mind through reading my writings.

I first met Quinn in 1974. I had obtained a copy of his then unpublished paper on Succession which was printed 2 years later in a 1976 issue of *BYU Studies*. I asked him for a copy of the whole text of a document which he had quoted on the "Patriarch being the highest office in the Church", but realizing my involvement in "Fundamentalism", he refused to help me. In our conversation I told him that he had made a big mistake in neglecting to mention the important place which the Holy Order occupied in the succession crisis. To this he responded by saying that he had never read anything which would indicate that the Holy Order had any authority, but that if I had seen anything, he would be glad to see it. To be sure, I knew that Quinn had seen plenty, as he had cited many of the basic sources in his paper, including the Rigdon trial, but through prejudice and ignorance, he had read over important materials with blinders on. Since he had refused to help me, I made no further effort to help him. Four years later, in 1978, Quinn openly displayed his own ignorance when his paper on the Holy Order was printed in *BYU Studies*. In this paper he again affirmed what he had told me four years before, namely that he had never seen anything which would indicate that the Holy Order had any authority that would involve succession (*BYU Studies* Vol. 19 <Fall 1978> 89–91).

In 1978, I published a short paper on "Priesthood and the Law of Succession" — it was only a brief introduction to the subject, though it did make solid connections to the Fullness of the Patriarchal Priesthood, but Quinn never saw this until several years later, when I sold him a copy from a table at one of the meetings

of the Mormon History Association. It would not be until Quinn saw Andrew Ehat's thesis in 81 or 82, that he would come to any understanding regarding the Fullness of the Priesthood and the natural part which it and the Holy Order played in the succession crisis of 1844. After the first edition of Quinn's paper on the Joseph Smith III blessing was published in the *John Whitmer Historical Society Journal*, I called him up hoping to get a copy of a document which he had printed in his paper. In the process of our discussion I told him about Brigham's December 25, 1857 statement which had never been published and which he had never seen and he offered to trade me for that which I asked, so I gave him the source. However, after giving him what he wanted, he refused to fulfill his end of the bargain.

Without question, Andrus, Quinn, Ehat and Esplin are some of the finest scholars ever to be raised up from among the Latter-day Saints, but to my own knowledge, none of them are above benefiting from or making use of the unpublished work, research and ideas of others, without acknowledging their sources, especially when that source comes from an unpopular sector, or an individual, the acknowledgment of whom would detract from their own standing in the Church and in the minds of others in the community of LDS scholars. And this is especially so if that person happens to be a Mormon Fundamentalist — anything is better than that — the Reorganized Church — Born again Fools — Catholics, Protestants — Jews — all of these are acceptable, but not a Mormon Fundamentalist!

I do not mean to infer by what I have said that I have never received anything or benefited from the work of others — quite to the contrary, I have, and from time to time different individuals have told me of materials which I was not aware of, and which have been greatly appreciated. Some of these occasions I have named here tonight — but there are other such occasions which I have not named. I have received things from others, but for the most part, they have always been willing to receive from me, but unwilling to give. There is one thing which I received from Ehat that I greatly

appreciated. He pointed out to me the application of William Law's Poem "Buck Eyes Lament" to Adam-God which was something I had read over years before without notice.

In many respects my life has been hedged up with disadvantages, especially when contrasted to the circumstances of the financially supported scholars in the Church. Most historians such as Ehat, Quinn and Esplin had paying jobs and secretaries, as well as financial backing, editors and publishing houses to print their work, and open access to most any material for which they could ask in their research. However this is in marked contrast to my own situation. Instead of having some foundation finance my work and research, with secretaries, editors and etc. — instead of being helped I was hindered. For religious reasons, in 1970 I was fired from my job with the Church Computer center, and then black balled so that I could not get other work in that field. Turning from this form of work I sought further education in hopes of finding a new line of work, but in 1971 after nearly a year in college, and after my training was nearly half finished, I was expelled from BYU college, for no other reason than because of my religious beliefs. Subsequent to this, I was again fired from several other jobs for religious reasons.

On top of all this, instead of being given general access to essential research materials as other scholars were, I was denied access to see anything in the archives at all. This was true except for a short period of time, but even when I did finally get access, it was only three or four months before I was forbidden by Joseph Anderson, who was then over the Historical Department, from even coming into the building. The big reason for this was because I had hired a genealogist to do research in order to get a list of names of all the women who were sealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith. When this genealogist finished, he found over three hundred and twenty women who were sealed to the Prophet. Of course, most of these were after his death. In any case, this genealogist was so proud of his work that he thought every one of the Apostles and all three members of the First Presidency ought each to have their own personal copy,

so he made fifteen copies of his research, bound them up and sent them off to the brethren. Upon seeing this material the authorities came down on the Genealogical Society like a ton of bricks and new policies were instantly in the making. No research of that kind would ever be done again, and when they found out that I had hired him, I was ordered never to come back into the building, whether in the Genealogical Society or the Historical Department. This was when the Genealogical Society was in the ivory tower.

All of this left me to my own resources. While they allowed me access I played by their rules, however, after they made their decision on me, I in turn made one for them, consequently I declared war on their policy. Where there is a will, there is a way, and so I made up a new set of rules by which to play the game. By and large, as far as getting materials out of the archives is concerned, these later methods proved to be far more affective.

Over the years there have been times when I have felt that my phone was tapped. One time my wife Bonnie and I had an argument on the phone, and it would appear from the discussion that our marriage was over. What is interesting about this is that only a day or so later a detective from Mark E. Peterson's office called my wife on the telephone and asked if he could have an interview with her. It is hard to believe that he would have thought that my wife would cooperate with him, had he not been aware of our difficulties. Immediately after his call, my wife got in touch with me and asked if she should meet with him. I told her to go ahead, and then told her what I felt he wanted to know and what to tell him. It was my opinion that Mark Peterson had hired this detective to find out how I was getting materials out of the church archives. Without realizing what might be the consequence to others, I told her to tell the detective that I had an inside connection who was giving me material. Actually this statement could be understood in more than one way, and without explaining things more completely, I did not expect that this detective would understand what was actually taking place. In this assumption I was correct. However, I felt bad, when a little while later I learned that there had been a house

cleaning at the Church archives, and that some of the employees there had been fired. The truth is, I never did receive any special favors, information or documents from any of them.

When the detective came to my wife's home, I was hiding in the back room where I could hear the conversation, and I had planted a tape recorder in the couch where he sat while he questioned my wife. My wife told him just what I asked her to. When he left I went to the window and watched him drive away. I was surprised when I saw that he was driving a car which was marked as follows: "Salt Lake City Police / Chaplain Service". Before that time, I was not aware that there was a chaplain service for the Salt Lake City Police, much less that they would be working for Mark E. Peterson. What business did a Salt Lake City Police Chaplain have working for Apostle Mark E. Peterson's office? Indeed if such an office actually exists in the Salt Lake City Police force, no doubt the Chaplin would find his job far more fulfilling, and his time far better spent in preaching to the officers, rather than playing detective for Mark E. Peterson's office.

Not long after this, a number of scholars reported the strange disappearance of some of their research files from their papers, and at the same time a whole box of my papers disappeared, which included my files on Second Anointings, Adoption and the Holy Order. Fortunately, I had shared copies of these with some of my friends so there was no permanent loss.

In 1987 when we finally got the first volume out on the unpublished speeches of Brigham Young, we were connected with a U.P.I. reporter who got the go ahead from his boss to write a story and book review on the Book. The Reporter was promised that if he wrote the story it would be published in over 200 different News papers nation wide, as well as some European papers. With this understanding from his boss, he spent a week going around interviewing prominent historians about the book. To the last, all the comments were very favorable. I warned the reporter that he should not reveal the purpose of his interview, but he insisted anyway. What he found out was that invaribly they were very candid

in their first interview, but that generally speaking they would not give him a second interview and in the end his boss canceled the story. After many calls he even managed to speak with Chayhill who was over the Church public relations and media. Instead of speaking against the book, Chayhill spoke of the utter bewilderment of the brethren that someone managed to get the materials out of the archives, as no one was supposed to have access to those things. Of course this was all "sauce for the goose" in the reporters review, however in the end, and just as I had warned, the Church had the last laugh. No sooner had the reporter finished the review but what his boss canceled the story.

You would think that a new book containing heretofore unpublished and controversial sermons of President Brigham Young, the second President of the Church and Utah's first governor, as well as the founder of BYU — you would suppose that such materials would be of interest at Brigham Young University and that a review would be printed in *BYU Studies*, nevertheless, it never happened. And for that matter, neither did *Dialogue*, or *Sunstone*. Both of these magazines were given a book and promised a review, but neither of them ever fulfilled their commitment. So much for their supposed unbiased scholarship. It just will not do to publish a review of a book written by a Mormon Fundamentalist. But then, it is typical for *Sunstone* to print garbage and that which is negative about the Prophet and Church History, far more readily than good.

It is significant that two weeks after the Brigham Young book hit the streets, all the Presidential papers in the Church archives were closed. This is true with the exception of the Joseph Smith papers, which were already out. Shortly after this the papers of all the apostles were also closed. As it turns out, all these papers were closed for a close scrutiny and refilming which would take the form of a red letter edition. All sensitive materials were having a red line drawn through them so that they would not show up when they were refilmed.

On one occasion when talking to Andrus, he argued that in accordance with prophecy the Saints might always discern who

had the Keys by the fact that the records would always remain in the hands of the Priesthood. Since the Church had them, it proved that they were right. I pointed out to Andrus that his reasoning was flawed — indeed the Book of Mormon tells of a man named Labon who thought the same thing. Labon had the records in his possession and thought he ought to keep them, but in the end he forfeited his life and head to Nephi who was commanded of the Lord to take them. Today we can thank God for Xerox as all that is needed is a copy.

The Prophet Joseph Smith was given a revelation that a record should be kept, but what good is the record if it remains quietly locked up and forever reposed in some dark vault where the Saints are not allowed to read it? It would seem from all the opposition that my life was hedged up every way, but the Lord inspired my mind with understanding, and my heart with hope and faith, and through opposition and struggle, the Lord has prepared me to do His work.

From the time that I had met him, Wesley had talked of writing on the Priesthood, and for this reason he asked me not to write on that subject, but rather, as far as my writing was concerned, to focus my attention on Adam-God — nevertheless, I still taught the doctrine of the Priesthood to all those who would hear it, including those in scholarly circles, and for this reason, there were many ideas, doctrinal concepts, and facts of history which were originally revealed through the channel of the Priesthood, but which were put into print through scholarly circles before they were published by the Priesthood. Yet it is nonetheless a fact that I was teaching many of the things which Ehat and others wrote about (and a great deal more) for more than a decade before Ehat put out his thesis in 1982 — and that too, in true missionary style, to everyone that I knew who would hear me.

Some might feel that it is a great disadvantage to have the things of God published outside the Channel of the Priesthood. Generally speaking I would agree, however in this case, it is my feeling that by and large the attention to these subjects from "reputable" sources has been good for the work. The mistakes and oversights

of the "scholars" will be easily corrected — the lies will be swept away and ultimately every truth which they have admitted will only serve to add fuel to the already growing fire. Unbeknownst to them, the materials and ideas which they have borrowed lead somewhere. That which they have incorporated into their writings is merely "the tip of the iceberg" and in the end, publishing what they have will only serve to lend credibility to the whole picture which is now forthcoming. How truly it is that all things will work to the glory of God.

I do not bring these things up to boast or to make any personal brag, but only to point out that in the most literal sense of the word, the knowledge of the Fullness of the Priesthood and other important topics relating to the Kingdom of God, has come through the channel of the Priesthood, just as the Prophet Joseph Smith has said that it would. This was the Prophet's teaching, that all "knowledge", "doctrine" and the "plan of salvation" would come to man through the channel of the Priesthood (*TPJS* 166–167), and so it has been in this work.

Culley Christiansen the author of Adam God Maze is another one of those who drank at the fountain head of the Priesthood. However, even though he accepted the doctrine, because of its poverty, ultimately he despised its source. Culley was a medical doctor, practicing in Arizona. When I first met him he was a typical unread member of the Church. I was introduced to him by one of his friends, whom I had taught and baptized. Culley took an interest in plural marriage, Adam-God and other fundamentalist doctrine, and soon after our meeting, he pulled up his roots and moved his practice and family to Bountiful Utah. Among other things, I taught him about Adam-God, the Church of the Firstborn, Adoption, the Patriarchal Priesthood, Second Anointings and etc.

My wife had a friend in the Allred Group, and this friend gave my wife copies of two different speeches which Owen Allred had delivered to the Relief Society in his group. In both of these speeches, Owen discussed the Second Anointing, and it was apparent from what he said, that Owen did not understand what the Second

Anointing was. I gave copies of these to Culley, who later shared with me his idea, that he wanted to start his own group. He wanted to proselyte among the Allreds and thought he could capitalize upon what I had taught him about Second Anointings by playing upon Owen's ignorance as manifest in the two speeches which he had given to the Relief Society.

To me this was totally wrong. Owen had received his priesthood through a legitimate commission to perpetuate plural marriage. Culley on the other hand, had received the doctrine of the Priesthood through me, but upon seeing its poverty, he rejected it, and thought to start his own church without authority, while at the same time, this new church would be predicated upon the doctrine and knowledge which Culley had received through me. For this reason I decided to teach Owen Allred about the Holy Order, Second Anointings and etc. I called him on the phone and he wanted to meet, so Owen and George Maycock came over to my wife Bonnie's home in Rose Park, where I taught them both about Second Anointings, Adoption and the Holy Order. I also gave them research files on these subjects.

Much to my surprise, it was not long after this that the Allreds decided to start administering temple endowments to their members. Bill Baird who was one of the Council members called me on the phone and asked if I would give them information on the Endowment ceremony. To this request, I refused, pointing out as I did, that according to their original Priesthood commission, they were only given authority to perpetuate Plural Marriage. I did however tell Mr. Baird about the A. C. Lambert collection at the University Library, which contained several boxes of material on the Endowment.

This request from Mr. Baird came soon after the Allreds had published their full page add in the *Salt Lake Tribune* on the blacks and the Priesthood. Most of this article consisted of a speech given by Brigham Young on February 5th, 1852. This speech focused on the subject of the Blacks and the Priesthood and had never been published until only shortly before, when I gave a typeset copy of it to one of

my adopted sons, who published it in a pamphlet along with about 5 other unpublished speeches. Hundreds of these pamphlets had been sold and circulated among members of the Allred group.

So to make a long story short, a lot of things happened in 1983 and 84 when Total Commitment was revealed to me. For the first time I began to understand the whole picture, some of which we have talked about tonight. I have been endeavoring to write these things and to make them available. I have not done it as mere research or as a historian — I am not really what you would call a college educated historian, but I do love the Gospel. I continued to teach through the years, and then in 1983, I received a revelation about the essence of the Priesthood — it pertained to things having to do with the Second Anointing. I've never seen a copy of the Adoption ceremony, but a few days after receiving this revelation on Priesthood, as I was laying in bed one morning, the whole adoption ceremony started running through my mind. It was like a marriage ceremony, only it was between two men — there are covenants, I do's and so forth.

A couple days later, I had another revelation, and then another, and then a vision and then later another revelation. Through these later revelations, God revealed to me the Principle of Total Commitment as it is lived in the Celestial Kingdom and the Church of the Firstborn. It was totally new to me — it took me several years to fully comprehend it.

There were things which I had read in Church history that were utterly shocking to me. They aren't in the history books which are printed by the Church, but they are in history all the same — things that the Prophet did which I did not understand — and things too that were offensive to all that I understood. When I had learned about these things, it was about 1978 or 77 and I didn't know what to do or think about them. All I knew was that Joseph Smith was a Prophet of God, and so I set the whole matter on the shelf — I knew Joseph was a Prophet, but I didn't know what to make of all these other things. Finally I decided not to consume my mind with them. But four years later, after receiving these revelatory and visionary

experiences on Total Commitment, all of a sudden I began to understand things that I had never before thought of — those things which were shocking to me were laid bare, and all the minuses in the Prophet's history were turned into plusses. Finally, even the New Testament was opened up to me. This happened while I was working on the Prophet's June 16th, 1844 speech — I was creating a new amalgamated text. While I was in the midst of this, I had another revelation, and the whole teaching of Jesus in the Gospels was opened up to me. Through this experience, I learned that the Principle of Total Commitment is all over in the Gospels — there are about 13 hard core scriptures in Matthew alone — it is not just one passage either, they are big chunks.

Things began to happen — I had spent fifteen years preaching about Adoption — about the Patriarchal Priesthood — about the skeletal structure of the Church of the Firstborn — and I had some understanding of other things as well, but I didn't understand the inner workings of the Church of the Firstborn until the Celestial Principle of Total Commitment was opened up to my mind through the experiences to which I have referred.

All these things were given to me by revelation and I began to try to get them into print. Last year I finally got my family into a place where we could be together and work without being totally distracted all the time and because of this I succeeded in getting more into print than I have ever before. There is a lot more that is not published, but the things that I have published, that have to do with doctrine, that are creative works, they are written by the Spirit of God and revelation. They contain many revelations in them — I have tried to document the revelations which I have received and to relate them to the history of the Church. After all, who am I! The Gospel is beautiful, but it has to be connected to the restoration and the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith. So it has been kind of like a scripture chase and a chase through history.

The basic foundation was given to me through Wesley's teachings in 1970 — and from that time on, through the Spirit of God and revelation my eyes were opened and I began to understand

true doctrine and Church history — especially that time pertaining to the Nauvoo period. All these things began to happen to me, but how would you know as you were not there. On one occasion the Prophet told the Saints that: "Knowledge is power, and the man who has the most Knowledge has the Greatest Power" (*HC* 5:392). At another time of great crisis, when thousands in the Church were doubting the Prophet's calling in the Priesthood and his standing before God, he stood up and proclaimed before the Saints that: "The best men bring forth the best works" and that "The man who tells you the words of life is the man who can save you" (*TPJS* 358) In continuing he told them that the revelation which he gave them and the things which he taught were a vindication of his Priesthood and standing before the Lord. And so it is with you tonight. You must judge by the Spirit of God and revelation to yourselves. Out of the abundance of my heart does my mouth speak — judge ye the Spirit and value of the revelation which I have given you tonight. Look to the Spirit of God and the Light of Revelation. "The man who tells you the words of Life is the Man who can Save you".

You were not there to witness my ordination in 1970 nor to see the struggle of my life since — you were not present to witness Wesley's ordination twenty years earlier in 1950 — nor that of his father's in 1904 — nor that of Benjamin F. Johnson in the Last Charge and Commission which he received directly from the Prophet. So how are you going to know about my Priesthood and ordination? You must learn the Truth by the Spirit of God and Revelation to yourselves.

When the Saints were first exposed to the restoration — how did they know about the Prophet's Priesthood? Do you think that they sat around questioning whether or not the Prophet was ordained or that he held the Priesthood through a viable source. No they did not. The Truth is that they did not so much as know that there had been a restoration of the Priesthood. The first document to be recorded in this dispensation, which even so much as mentions the restoration of the Priesthood was written down some time after July 1832, which was more than two years after the organization

of the Church, and this document was not made public. The first statement to be published regarding the restoration of the Aaronic Priesthood was printed in the *Messenger and Advocate* in October of 1834, which was four and a half years after the organization of the Church. There is in fact no detailed account or record in the *History of the Church* wherein the Prophet tells us about the restoration of the Melchizedek Priesthood by Peter, James and John, or even the date when it occurred. The same is true of the restoration in the Kirtland Temple when the Savior, Moses, Elias and Elijah appeared to the Prophet and Oliver Cowdery. We know when this occurred, but we have no mention of this restoration in any of the Prophet's discourses or letters. It was not until after the 1856 Publication of the *History of the Church,* which was after the Saints had moved to Utah, that the account which the Prophet has left us in the *History of the Church* was finally published in the *Deseret News* — it was not until 1856 that this was finally revealed to the Saints, which was twenty years after it happened, and twelve years after the Prophet's death. For some reason the Prophet chose to keep these things from the Saints. As the Prophet has told us, "There are many things which belong to the powers of the Priesthood and the keys thereof, that have been kept hid from before the foundation of the world; they are hid from the wise and prudent to be revealed in the last times" (*TPJS* 194) The Prophet told the Saints on one occasion that he could keep a secret until doomsday (*TPJS* 195), and so he proved in his life and actions — "you do not know my history", he told the Saints — "you do not know me and you never will." (New Amalgamated Text of the King Follet Sermon, see forthcoming issue of *Doctrine of the Priesthood*; see also *TPJS* 361)

So how did the Saints know that Joseph was a Prophet of God? They knew by the Spirit of God — they knew by the Inspiration and Revelation of Heaven to themselves personally. The Saints in Joseph Smith's day were converted by the Spirit of God — they had oil in their lamps. They read the Book of Mormon. And even though the Book of Mormon didn't give any revelation telling how Joseph had a right to set up a Church — and even though it didn't

tell about Angels coming and giving him the Priesthood, still the Saints — they were promised that if they would take that book and read it, the Spirit of God would come upon them, and they would be converted — they would know it was true. And when the Spirit of God did come upon them, they identified that work with Joseph Smith and they joined the Church. They knew he was a Prophet because he was the author of it, or at least the mortal channel through which it came.

This is the basis of this same evening here tonight — it is what you guys have to go by — the Spirit of God! I have told the history, but you weren't there — so you must possess the Spirit of God — you must have *oil in your lamps*, in order to discern that which is right. There are a lot of documents about it that have never been published, that will be some day — but the Revelation of God is here, and the Spirit of God is here, and it is in this work. I have given 22 years of my life and done little else since — and that revelation which God has given me, and which I have thus far published, together with the Spirit of God, is a vindication of the Priesthood that I received in 1970.

A year and a half ago, in 1990 the Lord revealed to me to go forward and formally organize the Church of the Firstborn on April 3rd of this month. There were twenty seven people baptized on that day. This is not to say that the Church of the Firstborn is fully organized — you do not, in fact, get baptized into the Church of the Firstborn — but the seed of its beginnings has been planted — the "Work of the Father" has started and it is a good beginning! The Prophets have said that "out of the hearts core of this people [meaning the Latter-day Saints] will come a people upon whom the Lord will bestow His choicest blessings" (*JD* 11:145; 15:357; *Des. News* Aug. 11, 1889; Nov. 6, 1875; Dec. 9, 1882; *Cont.* 10:362; *Mill. Star* 42:585). I invite you to participate in and become a part of this work. Give yourselves to it and receive the blessings which will enrich your lives and the lives of your children. I bear my testimony to you that I know this work is of God — it was revealed to me by revelation from Heaven and the creative works that I have

written are predicated on that revelation. I say this in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

Congregation: Amen.

Ursula: Do you want to have a closing hymn and a closing prayer? Did you bring some pamphlets?

Fred: We have a lot of pamphlets if you want to get copies of the things we have written. For those who can't afford them, they can have them for nothing — for those who can, we would appreciate it if you would pay for them — as it is our only means of livelihood.

Ursula: Who wants to chose a Hymn?

Response from the audience: "The Spirit of God, Like a Fire is Burning".

Song: "The Spirit of God like a Fire is burning — the latter glory begins to come forth. The visions and blessings of old are returning and angels are coming to visit the Earth. Well sing and well shout with the armies of heaven, hosanna, hosanna, to God and the lamb. Let glory to them in the highest be given hence forth and forever ahmen and ahmen, etc.

Closing Prayer by Jim Harmston.

Collier's Publishing Co. Order Form
New from Collier's Publishing:

Order Form *Quantity*

Unpublished Revelations Vol. 1, 3rd Enlarged Ed . . . . . $45.00 _____

The Book of Revelations . . . . . $30.00 _____

New Issues *of* Doctrine of the Priesthood

Vol. 28 No. 4 - The Early Israelite/Christian Doctrine Regarding The Incarnation of Yahweh And Satan At The Beginning of the World . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 29 No. 4 — The Practice of Plural Marriage In the Bible and The Obscuring of the Biblical Text in Passages Relating to Polygamy . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 4: The Latter-Day Practice of Plural Marriage Foretold In the Book of Mormon — The Prophet's March 1831 Revelations Regarding Plural Marriage & Eternal Marriage — The Prophet's 17 July 1831 Revelation Regarding Plural Marriage With the Lamanites — The Lord's 1833 Rebuke to Joseph and Emma For Not Having Entered into Plural Marriage, and The Prophet's Subsequent Marriage to Fanny Alger . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 7: Celestial Family Union and a Perfect Law of Theocracy, As Taught and Practiced by the Prophet Joseph Smith in his Extended Family Kingdom at Nauvoo, or "The Principle" . . $13.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 8: A New Amalgamated Text of Joseph's Last Doctrinal Discourse — the Plurality of Gods 16 June 1844 . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 9: The Sin of Sodom, or a Biblical Examination Of Homosexuality . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 2 — The Adam-God Doctrine as Taught in the Bible — Being A Response to Walter Martin . . . . . $14.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 8 — The One Anointed and Appointed and Its Relationship to The Church of the Firstborn and The Kingdom of God, or Council of Fifty . . . . . $12.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 11: The Whites — The Blacks and The Right of Priesthood — and Racism as Taught and Established by God in the Bible – Part 1 . . $14 .00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 12: The Curse Of Canaan, And Who Are The Canaanites, And What Ham Did UNTO Noah . . . . . $7 .00 _____

Vol. 32 No. 1: Regarding the Indian Prophet . . . . . $6.00 _____

Other Hardback Books

Unpublished Revelations Vol. 2 . . . . . $35.00 _____

The Teachings of President Brigham Young Vol. 3 1852–1854 . . . . . $35.00 _____

Manuscript History of Brigham Young 1847–1850 . . . . . $40.00 _____

President Brigham Young's Teachings on The Adam-God Doctrine, Vol 1, an Organized Collection of His Own Statements, by Fred C. Collier; Formerly Published under the Title: *President Brigham Young's Doctrine on Deity, Vol 1* . . . . . $45.00 _____

Order Form *Quantity*

Kirtland Council Minute Book . . . . . $30.00 _____

Nauvoo High Council Minute Books of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Edited by Fred C. Collier . . . . . $30.00 _____

The Office Journal of President Brigham Young — 1858–1863 Book D, edited by Fred C. Collier . . . . . $40.00 _____

Mary Cox Lee — A Remarkable Lady and an Inspired Principle . . . . . $16.00 _____

Issues *of* *Doctrine of the Priesthood*

Vol. 1 No. 2: *Re-Examining the Lorin Woolley Story* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 1 No. 3: *Polygamy in Mexico* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 1 No. 4: *The Church of the Firstborn & the Holy Order of God* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 1 No. 5: *Priesthood & the Law of Succession, Part 1 and 2* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 2 No. 1: *Unpublished Adam–God Discourses of Brigham Young 1852–1877* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 2 No. 2: *The Adam–God Doctrine in a Nutshell — The Doctrine as Taught by President Brigham Young in His Own Words;* formerly published under the title: *Brigham Young Speaks* . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 3 No. 1: *The Nauvoo Doctrine Part 1, The Concept* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 3 No. 2: *The Nauvoo Doctrine in Light of Alma Chapter 13* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 4 No. 1: *The Trials of Apostles John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 4 No. 2 *The Political Platform of the Manifesto* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 4 No. 3; Vol. 5 No. 1; Vol. 5 No. 2—*President Brigham Young's Doctrine on Deity — an Organized Collection of His Own Statements Part 1, Part 2, Part 3* . . . . . $20.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 3: *So, You Want Celestial Glory* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 4: *The Trinity and the Holy Spirits — The Doctrine as Joseph Taught It,* 3rd. Enlarged Ed. . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 5: *The Suspension of Plural Marriage and the Fulfillment Of Prophecy* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 6: *In Defence of Celestial Marriage* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 8: *Polygamy: Its Genetic and Sociological Consequences* . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 10 *Joseph Smith's Grammar & Alphabet of the Egyptian Language* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 11: *Angel of the Prairies* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 6 No. 1: *Nauvoo Diaries & Writings of William Clayton Part 1 The Temple History Journal* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Order Form *Quantity*

Vol. 7 No. 5: *Patriarch Benjamin F. Johnson's Letter to Elder George F. Gibbs, 1903* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 8: *Analyzing the Different Orders of the Patriarchal Priesthood* . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 9: *Independent Fundamentalists and Their Claims to the Fulness of the Priesthood* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 10: *The Apostleship: Apostolic Succession and the Authority Of the Quorum of the Twelve* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 12: *The Trial of Sidney Rigdon First Counselor to the Prophet Joseph Smith* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 1: *New Light on the Ancient Hebrew/ Christian Doctrine On Deity Part 1* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 2: *The Common Origin of Ancient Hebrew/Pagan Religion And the Demise of Goddess the Hebrew* . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 3: *The Matriarchal Priestess-hood & Emma's Right to Succession as High Priestess & Queen* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 4: *Adoption — Law of the Kingdom, Forgotten Doctrine Of Mormonism* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 10: *Answers to Contradictions and Scriptural Problems Relating to the Adam-God Doctrine* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 9 No. 4: *The Church of the Firstborn and its Formal Organization On April 3rd, 1992; Together with a Brief Summary of Its Principles and Doctrinal Teachings and a Short History of Succession in the Priesthood* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 10 No. 1: *The One Anointed and Appointed — That One Man Office In the Priesthood — An Open Letter to All Those Who Would be Saints* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 12 No. 4: *The Father and the Son the Two Gods of the Old Testament* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 13 No. 1: *New Light on the Lorin Woolley Story and Early Fundamentalist Beginnings* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 18 No. 1: *The Church of the Firstborn — It Articles of Faith and a Short History from the Time of Adam to the Present* . . . . .$6.00 _____

Vol. 28 No. 4: *The Early Israelite/Christian Doctrine Regarding The Incarnation of Yahweh and Satan At The Beginning of The World* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 29 No. 4: *The Practice of Plural Marriage in the Bible and The Obscuring Of the Biblical Text in Passages Relating to Polygamy* . . . . .$10.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 4: *Plural Marriage in the Book of Mormon and Early Church History — The Lord's 1833 Rebuke to Joseph and Emma For Not Having Entered into Plural Marriage and The Prophet's Subsequent Marriage to Fanny Alger* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Order Form *Quantity*

Vol. 30 No. 7: *Celestial Family Union and a Perfect Law of Theocracy, As Taught and Practiced by the Prophet Joseph Smith in his Extended Family Kingdom at Nauvoo, or "The Principle"* . . . . . *$13.00* _____

Vol. 30 No. 8: *A New Amalgamated Text of Joseph's Last Doctrinal* Discourse — the Plurality of Gods 16 June 1844 . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 9: The Sin of Sodom, or a Biblical Examination Of Homosexuality . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 2: The Adam-God Doctrine as Taught in the Bible — Being A Response to Walter Martin . . . . . $14.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 8: The One Anointed and Appointed and Its Relationship to The Church of the Firstborn and The Kingdom of God, or Council of Fifty . . . . . $10 .00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 11: The Whites — The Blacks and The Right of Priesthood — and Racism as Taught and Established by God in the Bible – Part 1 – . . . . . $14 .00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 12: The Curse Of Canaan, And Who Are The Canaanites, And What Ham Did To Noah . . . . . $7 .00 _____

Vol. 32 No. 1: Regarding the Indian Prophet . . . . . $6.00 _____

Bundled Set
of
Hardback Books

100% Retail . . . . . Total: $346.00 ———

30% Off

30% Discount . . . . . Total: $242.20 _____

———

3 or More Copies
of
Any Hardback Book or Books
20% Discount

———

Bundled Set
of
All Issues
of
Doctrine of the Priesthood

100% Retail for 42 Issues . . . . . Total: $299.00
40% Discount . . . . . Total: $179.40 _____

Sub-Total: $ _____

Shipping add 10%, $4.00 Min. $25.00 Max.: $ _____

COD add $3.50: $ _____

Total: $ _____